DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 427 JC 740 240

AUTHOR	Goodwin, Gregory L.
TITLE	A Social Panacea: A History of the Community-Junior College Ideology.
PUB DATE	Sep 73
NOTE	316p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$15.00 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Colleges; Educational Change; *Educational History; Educational Practice; *Educational Theories; Historical Reviews; *Junior Colleges; *Social Influences

ABSTRACT

This examination of the community-junior college ideology is divided into the following areas: (1) an introductory historical review of the development of the community-junior college movement; (2) the junior college and the age of efficiency (1890-1920); (3) the rise of "terminal education" (1920-1941), including the emphasis on "social intelligence," vocational curricula, selectivity, guidance, and the impact of the depression; and (4) acceptance without understanding (1945 to the present), including guidance, vocational-technical education, and the impact of WW II and the Cold War. The fifth and final chapter deals with the problem of the terminal student, vocational versus general education, and minority groups and the "open door." An emphasis is placed throughout the study on the lives and theories of major spokesmen of the movement. A 25-page bibliography is provided. (KM)

ED 093427

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AV

A SOCIAL PANACEA:

A HISTORY OF THE COMMUNITY-JUNIOR COLLEGE IDEOLOGY

JC 740 240

Gregory L. Goodwin
Bakersfield, California
September, 1973

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Numerous people provided the personal and professional support that enabled me to complete this book. Members of my doctoral committee at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign--Drs. Terry O'Banion, Jo Ann Fley, Clarence Karier, Robert Pingry, Paul Riegel, and Paul Violas--were all helpful beyond words. Dr. O'Banion in particular supported my research efforts after the dissertation stage. His guidance and personal encouragement were immensely valuable.

Many librarians throughout the nation, from Washington, D.C., to California, freely offered needed assistance. Facilities granted to me at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and at the Los Angeles and Santa Barbara campuses of the University of California were much appreciated and fully used. Mr. Jack Gernhart of the staff of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in Washington, D.C. was remarkably helpful in providing materials and workspace for my investigation there.

A grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities enabled me to carry my research into areas of significance untouched by my doctoral study. Without such help, I could not have completed this work.

My wife, Peggy, provided needed encouragement and was my most careful and competent assistant in the preparation of the manuscript. Added to her responsibilities as wife, mother, and teacher, her burden was not an easy one.

Others, too numerous to mention, reacted to the manuscript and provided insights and corrections. My appreciation for all those instrumental in the execution of this work is limitless.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

I. INTRODUCTION.. 5

Historical Significance of the Community-Junior College Movement.. 6
Definitions.. 7
National Spokesmen for the Community-Junior College Movement.. 11
Stages of Development.. 13
Precursors of the Community-Junior College Idea............ 15

II. THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE AGE OF EFFICIENCY.............. 19

Harper, Jordan, and Lange.. 20
The Hallmark of Efficiency.. 24
Evolution and Elitism.. 31
William Rainey Harper.. 37
David Starr Jordan.. 64
Alexis F. Lange.. 75
Efficiency and the Junior College.. 86

III. THE RISE OF "TERMINAL EDUCATION".. 93

Koos, Eells, and Campbell.. 95
Other Community-Junior College National Spokesmen During the 1920's and 1930's..116
The Meaning of Junior College Terminal Education...........140
The Emphasis Upon Social Intelligence..144
General Education: The Curriculum for "Social Intelligence"..150
Vocational Curricula..156
Selectivity and Guidance..161
The Impact of the Depression..169
The Lingering Dedication to Efficient Educational Reorganization..173
Friends and Enemies..178
Rhetoric and Reality..185

IV. ACCEPTANCE WITHOUT UNDERSTANDING..189

New Spokesmen for the Community-Junior College Movement..193
Continuing Voices from the Past..225
The Impact of World War Two and the Cold War...............238
Ideas and Efforts Toward a Vocational-Technical Education..245

CHAPTER Page

Developments in Guidance....................................251
Where is the "Community College?"...........................257

V. OLD PROBLEMS AND NEW PROSPECTS...........................261

The Problem of the Terminal Student.........................262
Vocational Versus General Education.........................272
Minority Groups and the "Open Door".........................279
Conclusion..287

BIBLIOGRAPHY..290

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> There appears to be no sound reason to neglect one of the most rapidly expanding segments of education: one that is destined to influence American life; one that grows by reason of its basic concept for better community living; that is being increasingly geared to present-day industrial and economic conditions; that aims at the further equalization of educational opportunities.
>
> --Jesse P. Bogue[1]

The segment of American education that Jesse P. Bogue charged was being neglected by American historians in 1950 was one that went by various names: junior colleges, community colleges, two-year colleges, city colleges, technical institutes, and people's colleges. As Executive Secretary of the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC), an organization that encompassed institutions with all of the above-mentioned titles, Bogue was very much aware of the lack of historical materials describing and explaining the half-century old community-junior college movement. With over 600 institutions in AAJC by 1950, Bogue had sufficient reason to question why they had escaped the historian's notice. Now, in 1973, there are over a thousand such institutions in existence, and there is still precious little information yielding any historical perspective.

---

[1] Jesse P. Bogue, The Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950), p. 135.

Historical Significance of the Community Junior-College Movement

The phenominal growth of the community-junior college movement does not itself justify an intensive historical study. But more is involved in this movement than a mere proliferation of institutions. Major currents of educational reform, reflecting the hopes and the fears of the larger American society, have guided the path of the community-junior college movement. The dominant social value placed upon efficiency, social intelligence, and a rationalized work force had underscored the public acceptance of the movement. The ostensibly simple debate over reorganizing public education on a 8-4-4 Year Plan or a 6-3-3-2 Year Plan, for instance, was more than an argument over administrative convenience and economy--rather it reflected an overwhelming concern for efficiency, with efficiency defined as a moral virtue as well as an economic gain. The progressive education movement, as another example, which attempted to alter all educational institutions in the early twentieth century, found that its basic rhetoric became most permanently embedded in the ideology of the then-blossoming community-junior college movement. The social importance of curricular reforms in vocational education and general education was nowhere voiced more strongly than by spokesmen for the community-junior college. And the birth of the student personnel movement not only coincided with the birth of the community-junior college movement--they were, in fact, meshed together. Still today the most articulate advocates for the "student-personnel-point-of-view" exist in the nation's community junior-colleges.

Rich as it is in historical significance, the history of the community-junior college has been little explored. Despite the fact that the history of the community-junior college intertwines with that of secondary and higher education, noted historians in both fields have altogether overlooked the significance of the movement.[1] Within the community-junior college it has become a cliche to speak of an identity crisis, partly in recognition of an unexplored past and partly out of dismay with confusion today.[2] Beneath the omission of the historian and beyond the myopia of the community-junior college "establishment" lies a fertile field of study. This study seeks to enter that realm.

Definitions

At the outset it is important to clarify some terminology. In this study the term "community-junior college" is used as if it were a definite entity. Actually, the terms "junior college" and "community college" are more commonly used to refer to particular two-year institutions. The value of the term "community-junior college" is that it symbolizes the interrelationship between two major ideas in the movement-- (1) that the institutions shall be integrately bound to their local communities, and (2) that the institutions shall faithfully duplicate the first two years of four-year, senior institutions. Furthermore the term "community-junior college" is historical in nature, reflecting the common roots and development of the many various two year institutions that today enroll more than half of the nation's freshmen and sophomore students.

---

[1] Three standard histories of American higher education have not allotted more than five pages collectively to the community-junior college movement. John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition (New York: Harper & Row, 1968); Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Vintage Books, 1962); Lawrence Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (University of Chicago Press, 1965). Very little is said either about this movement in Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Vintage Books, 1961); or in Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1890-1920 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969).

[2] Doyce B. Nunis and Richard M. Easone, "The Junior College Search for an Educational Identity," Junior College Journal, XXXIII (November, 1962), pp. 121-124.

The community-junior college movement began as the "junior college" movement, and it is still known as such to large segments of the educational community. The nomenclature of community-junior colleges has always been a problem; as Walter Crosby Eells, an early leader in the movement, observed in his day: "The only way you knew whether an institution was a junior college or not was when it identified itself as such."[1] Since World War II, the title of "community college" has been gaining increasing acceptance, but the 1971 American Association of JC's Directory still listed more "junior colleges" than "community colleges," although the trend throughout the 1950's and 1960's has been toward the name of "community colleges."[2] In 1972, the AA of JC changed its name to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in recognition of this trend.

While private junior colleges have not generally been eager to transform themselves into "community colleges," since they often draw students from various sections of the nation, they do share a common history and are a part of the overall development of the "community-junior college movement." Four times as many private junior colleges as public ones were represented in the 1920 meeting in St. Louis that founded AAJC, but that ratio has been nearly reversed in 1971 AAJC membership.[3]

The early junior colleges focused primarily upon transfer programs and what was labeled citizenship training. The emphasis upon trade and technical skills, evident today in the community-junior college movement, did not develop significatnly until the 1930's. The vocational education movement at the turn of the century, agitated by debates between William Torrey Harris and Calvin M. Woodward, is scarcely noticeable in the rhetoric of early junior college leaders. The founding fathers of the community-junior college movement did not envision the junior college as a place for the masses, but rather as an institution for "semi-professionals,"--a class of workers clearly above the level of the common laborer but just as clearly below the professional elite of society.

---

[1] From an interview with Michael Brick, cited in Brick's Forum and Focus, p. 36.

[2] Directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971 (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971) pp.103-116.

[3] Brick, Forum and Focus, pp. 197-199; Directory of AAJC, 1971, p. 88. According to the 1971 AAJC Directory, there were 847 public and 244 private institutional members.

It is no easier to define "ideology" than it is to define the "community-junior college movement." The term "ideology" has a variety of meanings, historically and in common usage.[1] From Marx and Mannheim it has gained a negative connotation of falseness, of a lofty rationale created by a group to conceal selfish economic and social interests. Modern sociologists, political scientists, and historians, however, often use the concept as a mental reflection of, or a part of, reality without assuming it to be a subterfuge. The term generally differs from related concepts--such as purposes, goals, objectives, etc.--in that (1) it deals in particular with the ideas of groups as applied to their actual or idealized society; (2) it implies that ideas need to be understood in their particular situations; and (3) it assumes the ability of an objective observer to determine the relationship of ideas to group interests. These elements are evident in most conceptions of "ideology," and they can be detected in Louis Wirth's appraisal of Karl Mannheim:

> He has succeeded in showing that ideologies, i.e. those complexes of ideas which direct activity toward the maintenance of the existing order, and utopias--or those complexes of ideas which tend to generate activities toward change in the prevailing

---

[1] See Nigel Harris, Beliefs in Society: The Problem of Ideology (London: C. A. Watts & Co., 1968).

> order--do not merely reflect thought from the object of observation, but also serve to fix attention upon aspects of the situation which otherwise would be obscurred or pass unnoticed.[1]

The general working definition of "ideology" used in this study is as follows: the integrated body of ideas--assumptions, assertions, theories and aims--of a group which emerges when ideals are stated and actions are proposed. This definition is in keeping with the one employed by historians Michael Katz and Merrill D. Peterson:

> The term "ideology" is given to that syntheses of ideas and representations designed to state an ideal and to motivate action. It may be true in some of its parts; but it is a gross oversimplification both of history and of the existing situation, the true recognition of which would not be in accord with the feelings and interests of the men who advance the ideology.[2]

It is no coincidence that studies of ideology became popular during the era that the ideologies of communism and fascism were challenging democratic beliefs; these foreign and alien systems of ideas could be quite easily understood as idealistic covers for self-seeking and nefarious schemes. An analysis of domestic ideas is less likely to meet the assumption that ideological pronouncements and actual intentions are at variance. Perhaps more agreement could be found if such an analysis purported only to dissect the "social ideas" of men, as Merle Curti set out to do in his study of various American educators.[3]

---

[1] Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1936) p. xxiii.

[2] This definition originated with Merrill D. Peterson, The Jefferson Image in the Amieican Mind (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960) p. 21, and was adopted by Michael Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968) p. 14.

[3] Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (Patterson, N.J.: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959).

Despite the acknowledged difficulties in defining the exact nature of both "community-junior colleges" and "ideology," this study nonetheless attempts to determine the relationship between the two. It is hoped that what's lost in the way of precision will be compensated for by a broader, more encompassing perspective on the identity of the community-junior college movement--an identity revealing both the ideal and the actual purposes of the movement.

National Spokesmen For the Community-Junior College Movement

Brown and Mayhew have noted that the multiple purposes of community-junior colleges are "partly the result of historical accident and partly the result of an unusually effective group of theorists."[1] In regard to the latter, Brown and Mayhew referred to the writings of Leonard V. Koos, Walter C. Eells, James Reynolds, Leland Medsker, and Edmund Gleazer. In order to identify a larger number of important community-junior college national spokesmen, this study tallied all indexed works relating to two-year colleges in the Readers' Guide (Poole's Guide for pre-1900 listings) and the Education Index. The names of authors that appeared frequently (arbitrarily defined as a minimum of ten entries) were considered probable spokesmen for the c-j movement.[2]

---

[1] Hugh S. Brown and Lewis B. Mayhew, American Higher Education (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965), p. 37.

[2] This system of selection was not considered a guarantee that important, influential community college leaders would not be overlooked., nor was it considered a guarantee that some less important, uninfluential persons would not be included. It was assumed, however, that the publishing criterion would be sufficient to produce a broad enough cross-section of community-junior college leaders that their writings would reveal the community-junior college ideology, probably with considerable overlapping. This assumption was supported in a study by Jack H. Aldridge, "A Comparative Study of Ideas and Theories, Concerning Junior Colleges, of Educational Leaders: 1900-1935 and 1945-1960" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,

The names of community-junior college spokesmen which were determined by this publishing criterion were as follows:

Jesse P. Bogue
Doak S. Campbell
C. C. Clovert
Walter Crosby Eells
Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.
John W. Harbeson
William Rainey Harper
Robert M. Hutchins
B. Lamar Johnson
David Starr Jordan
Leonard V. Koos
Alexis F. Lange
S. V. Martorana
Leland L. Medsker
Nicholas Ricciardi
James W. Reynolds
Lewis W. Smith
James M. Wood
George F. Zook

The selection proved to be satisfactory in terms of the distribution of the spokesmen over the span of years in the study and also in terms of their geographic distribution. Robert M Hutchins proved to be more a self-appointed spokesman for the community-junior college movement, and S. V. Martorana proved to be ideologically unfathomable because his writings were largely limited to descriptions of state legislation and organizational patterns. Overall, however, I found the writings of these men to contain ample evidence of ideological positions. The list was not intended to be an exhaustive one, but it was meant to be sufficient to provide substantial insight into the community-junior college ideology.

The writings of these selected national community-junior college spokesmen, then, constitute the primary source material for this study. As the following chapters reveal, the ideology of the community-junior college movement as expressed by these leaders formed a powerful and unifying force.

Stanford University, 1968). Aldridge constructed a list of influential community-junior college leaders by asking 55 professors who taught courses on community-junior colleges and community-junior college specialists in state departments of education to rank-order thirty national community-junior college leaders. From 36 replies, he constructed a listing of sixteen leaders as prominent community-junior college leaders: all sixteen names also appear in this writer's list based on the publishing criterion.

Argument and division occurred at times, but what stands out the most is the uniformity of the ideology. Although the rhetoric changed from one generation to the next, and various purposes were emphasized or de-emphasized in keeping with the climate of the times, the basic mission of the community-junior college as a panecea for social ills remained consistent. These educational leaders knew the kind of a world they wanted--a world that would be orderly, efficient, and productive, and they knew the type of man they wished to mold--a man with the social conscience to blend harmoniously into the community and with the skills to perform his proper role at his proper level. More than any other level of education, these leaders looked to the community-junior college as a social panacea. The elementary schools existed for the masses and the universities adequately educated the professional elite. It would be the unique mission of the community-junior college to train men for "middle management" or as "foremen for society." If such a force of men were properly developed, it was argued, it could reduce possible friction between the educated elite and the masses. In addition, it could provide skilled assistants, or "semi-professionals," to relieve at minimum cost the workload of the talented managers and professionals of the society. The hierachy of society was never questioned; indeed, it was idealized.

Stages of Development

The community-junior college movement has been consistently concerned with educational and social efficiency, and it has consistently attempted to prepare a social class to fill the needs of a developing industrial society. Yet within these consistencies there has been four distinct phases with unique points of emphasis. The initial development of the junior college idea, and the sporatic institutionalization of that idea, took place during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early part of the twentieth century. During this period university leaders headed the movement, and they embraced the junior college as a place where the university might unload its burden of adolescents. The goal was to free the university for the higher pursuit of scientific research. Borrowing heavily from the educational design in Germany, these men saw the advantages of more efficient social stratifications in the United States. It was thought that higher education could only be advanced by stratifying various other educational levels in keeping with divisions in human talent.

The second stage of the community-junior college movement occurred between the two world wars. Leaders emerged who were solely committed to the concept of the community-junior college and who sought independence from the domination of university spokesmen. Still concerned with "social efficiency," these leaders struggled with the problem presented by the fact that the so-called "terminal student" aspired to the traditional baccalaureate degree. Time and again they developed masterly "terminal programs," only to have them rejected by a status conscious educational consumer.

After World War Two a third stage of the community-junior college movement came about. Germany, after two wars, was no longer an awe-inspiring model. The fear of communism created in Americans a desire to unify and seek out enemies, foreign and domestic. Everywhere "citizenship training" and "general education" were promoted to develop national unity and agreement upon common values. Community-junior college advocates did not lose sight of the worker, but they rallied around the loftier goal of preparing loyal citizens.

Most recently the community-junior college movement has shifted once again to a concern for the proper ordering of society, addressing itself specifically to the question of whom is best fit to do what. An increasing emphasis upon technical and vocation education, particularly for the "terminal student," is everywhere apparent. Always a favorite with local boards, this goal has increasingly become the target of federal-aid programs. No longer do the leaders of the community-junior college try to elevate their position with any claim of producing a new and higher class of human talent in society. Instead, their developing goal is one of producing better honed cogs, wherever needed, in the existing industrial society.

As distinct as these four stages in the growth and development of community-junior colleges has been, however, their differences are subordinate to the overriding mission of the movement as a social panacea. Implicit in the evangelical rhetoric of the community-junior college movement is the idea that this booming institution is the best hope for insuring an orderly society and an efficient economy. For all of its claim of innovation and rejuvination, the community-junior college movement stands as a profoundly conservative movement. Its primary objective at all times has been social stability, not social change.

Precursors of the Community-Junior College Idea

This study's analysis of the community-junior college ideology commences with the 1890's. Before that time the community-junior college existed more as an idea than as an ideology. Long before 1896, the year that William Rainey Harper attached the name of "junior college" to an educational unit comprising the freshmen and sophomore years in the university, the ideal of the junior college, if not its name, had already been articulated. In particular, Henry P. Tappan at the University of Michigan during the 1850's and William Watts Folwell at the University of Minnesota in the 1870's stand out as university presidents who articulated the junior college idea. Many of their arguments were incorporated into the rhetoric of twentieth century advocates of the community-junior college, and thus they deserve some attention. But Tappan and Folwell are not included in the main body of this study because they were not the ideological promoters of the community-junior college idea; they did not commit themselves fully to the establishment of such colleges and they did not idealize as much as Harper and others the role that such colleges would play in the restructuring of American society.

Both Tappan and Folwell were very much impressed by the nature of the German university where both had gone to pursue specialized studies unavailable in American higher education in the nineteenth century. Their pioneering attempts to establish a "true" university in the United States were not successful, contested as they were by the liberal arts tradition of the established American colleges. Most leaders in American higher education during the nineteenth century held that their proper concern should be the development of men of character and social refinement, men with balanced faculties, not single-minded specialists seeking knowledge in one isolated field of scholarship.

In Tappan and Folwell's conception of a true university, there was no room for the traditional college which emphasized cultural refinement rather than scientific and scholarly achievement. Such general training was left to the gymnasium which would screen students for the university and attend to their general training.[1] At any rate, Tappan and Folwell were unsuccessful in generating enough support for their idea of a proper university, let alone its feeder institutions. Tappan was dismissed from the presidency of Michigan in 1863 after eleven frustrating years of trying to establish a research-oriented university. His ideas and manners were too foreign to the public's conception of education and educators; he spoke too much of Germany, dared to drink wine with dinner, and proclaimed that the development of character was not the function of the university. A local newspaper charged that Tappan was "the most completely foreignized specimen of an abnormal Yankee, we have ever seen."[1] Folwell actually persuaded Minnesota's Board of Regents to approve a plan to organize the freshmen and sophomore years of the university into a "collegiate department," with the aim of eventually shifting the general instruction in that department from the university to the public schools. The Minnesota Plan, as the reorganization was called, operated without attracting a great deal of attention from 1871-1885, at which time Folwell's successor in the presidency, Cyrus Northrop, had it dropped.[2]

---

[1] Henry P. Tappan, University Education (New York: George P. Putnam, 1851), pp. 43-49; William Watts Folwell, University Addresses (Minneapolis: H. W. Wilson Co., 1909), pp. 100-113.

Having thus acknowledged that there were earlier roots to the community-junior college idea, it remains the contention of this study that the association of the idea with an ideology, distinctly American and with considerable popular appeal, did not occur until the turn of the century. Although William Rainey Harper, David Starr Jordan, and Alexis F. Lange shared many German-inspired ideas on higher education with Tappan and Folwell, the case they made for the junior college, as shall be seen in the next chapter, had clearly American overtones. Rather than a mere device to assure a better university, the community-junior college became an answer proposed for the problems of society--it became, ideologically speaking, part of the means advocated by which to achieve the ideal society.

---

[1] Cited in Rudolph, The American College and University, p. 234.

[2] Daniel R. Gerber, "William Watts Folwell and the Idea of the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XLI (March, 1971), 52.

CHAPTER II

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE AND THE AGE OF EFFICIENCY

From 1890 to 1920, the United States experienced massive change and upheaval while becoming an industrialized nation. Two wars, three major recessions, the political phenomena known as Populism and Progressivism, and an overwhelming influx of immigrants confronted Americans with the uncertainties of a changing world. Any attempt to trace a single concept through these years can be compared to following the course of a piece of driftwood through a typhoon. The currents of educational thought from 1890 to 1920 reveal the turgid action characteristic of the nation as a whole.[1] Ideas that appear upon first glance merely simple plans to restructure the educational edifice for obviously practical reasons become, upon closer examination, attempts to restructure society in order to calm the storm.

The idea of the junior college during this era, as expressed by William Rainey Harper, David Starr Jordan, and Alexis F. Lange is one such deceptively simple idea. On the surface it appears no more than a by-product of the growth of the university which, turning to specialized research, sought to cast off the function of teaching general knowledge unenthusiastically carried on at its lower levels. In these terms, the idea of the junior college was no different than that expressed by Tappan and Folwell. But a closer examination of the ideas of Harper, Jordan, and Lange reveals that their promotion of the junior college idea was tied inextricably into an over-arching plan designed to alter the nature of society and to regulate the vicissitudes they feared in the nature of man.

---

[1] The mainstream of educational thought in these years, powerful and yet diversified, can be found in Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators and in Cremin, The Transformation of the School. For higher education in particular, although the junior college idea is largely ignored, the best source revealing the dynamic scope and power of educational ideas is Veysey, The Emergence of the American University.

This chapter provides a brief introduction of Harper, Jordan, and Lange, and then turns to an analysis of key concepts in their thinking. From their general view of society and their particular design for a new educational system will emerge the ideological framework surrounding the institutionalization of the community-junior college.

Harper, Jordan, and Lange

William Rainey Harper (1856-1906), born the son of storekeepers in New Concord, Ohio, exemplified the type of "efficient" man and productive scholar that he hoped would advance the nation toward higher levels of social evolution. He received his bachelor's degree at age fourteen from Muskingum College, primarily a school for aspiring Presbyterian ministers. After a few years of clerking at his father's store, he went on to Yale University where he gained a Ph.D. in semitic languages at age eighteen. Harper then spent ten years teaching Latin, Greek, and eventually his specialty, Hebrew, at Baptist institutions, Denison University in Ohio and the Baptist Union Theological Seminary at Morgan Park (Chicago), before being appointed professor of semantic languages at Yale in 1886. Harper taught at Yale for five years, then returned to the midwest in 1891 as the first president of the Rockefeller-endowed University of Chicago, a position he held until his death in 1906. Harper also found time on the side to work at the Chautauqua University from 1883 to 1898, teaching various summers as well as correspondence courses, and serving as the principal of Chautauqua University's College of Liberal Arts for ten of those years. Harper is known primarily for his successful efforts at Chicago in developing a major American research university. His frequent writings on the junior college stem from his concern for a "proper" university.[1]

David Starr Jordan (1851-1931) could well have been a Baptist and a Yale graduate like Harper had not his parents left the church because of doubts about eternal damnation and had not Cornell University offered him a scholarship to deter him from his plan to attend Yale. At Cornell, Jordan was allowed to pursue his special interest in nature studies (a permissiveness developed by Cornell's President Andrew D. White), which he could not have done at tradition-bound Yale. In his junior year Jordan was even employed to teach a class in biology at Cornell. Jordan frequently acknowledged his intellectual debt to White, and he felt honored that White, after declining the presidency at Stanford, recommended Jordan for the position to Governor and Mrs. Stanford. Before his appointment as the first president of Stanford University, Jordan had taught in a variety of institutions--a weak college calling itself a university, a high school, and a state university--all of which were to help shape his ideas of a proper, and improper, educational system. In 1885 Jordan stepped "temporarily" into the presidency at Indiana University where he had taught for six years. This move determined the rest of his career, for he remained as president there until moving to Stanford in 1891.

---

[1] An informative but uncritical biography of Harper is Thomas W. Goodspeed, William Rainey Harper (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928). The authors of the following two books carefully researched Harper's personal papers with scholarly criticism: Joseph E. Gould, The Chautauqua Movement (New York: State University of New York, 1961); Richard J. Storr, Harper's University: The Beginnings (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966). Paul Shorey's sketch of Harper in The Dictionary of American Biography, 1932, VIII, 287-292, contains a brief but good account of Harper's life.

While Harper enjoyed ample and unrestricted philanthropic contributions at Chicago, Jordan built up Stanford under continual financial problems and the interference of Mrs. Stanford. After her husband's death in 1893, Mrs. Stanford acted as the university's sole trustee for the next twelve years. She kept a vigilant eye on the "monument" she and her husband had built to their dead son. Jordan struggled along at Stanford, sacrificing many of his ideas (including the junior college idea) to financial "realities" until his retirement in 1916. The national fame he acquired came less through his work as a scientist or as a university president than it did through his active involvement in the peace movement which made him, according to Richard Hofstadter, "probably the best known of all the peace advocates and anti-expansionists" in the United States.[1]

Alexis F. Lange (1862-1924) did not collaborate with an industrial philanthropist in the founding of a university, as did Harper and Jordan. His long career as a teacher of teachers and as a publicist for the junior college idea, however, probably spread his influence as effectively, although more diffusely, as the university presidents Harper and Jordan. More thoroughly a product of the midwest than either Harper or Jordan, Lange was both raised and educated in that section of the country. He received both his bachelor and master's degree three years after entering the University of

---

[1] Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1959), p. 195. No more thorough and fascinating account of Jordan's life exists than his 1553-page autobiography: David Starr Jordan, The Days of a Man: Being Memories of a Naturalist, Teacher and Minor Prophet of Democracy, (2 vols.; New York: World Book Co., 1922). For a brief introduction to Jordan see Barton W. Evermann's article in The Dictionary of American Biography, 1933, X, 211-214.

Michigan, as a result of educational experimentation continuing from the days of Henry Tappan, and received a Ph.D. in English and Scandinavian Literature from the same institution in 1892. For thirty-four years, Lange worked at the University of California at Berkeley, beginning as an English professor in 1890 and serving as Dean of the College of Letters from 1897 to 1909, Dean of the Graduate School, 1909 to 1910, and Dean of Faculties from 1910 to 1913. Lange switched his professorial appointment from the English department to the School of Education in 1907 and became Director of the School in 1913, remaining in that capacity until his death in 1924. Lange did not become a national figure like Harper and Jordan. He directed his efforts and gained his reputation singularly in the state of California, yet the junior college system he helped establish in that state has served as a model for many other states in the nation and has contributed far more than one-fiftieth of the community-junior college ideology.[1]

The lives of Harper, Jordan, and Lange did not revolve around the junior college, and neither did their ideas. Their conception of the junior college existed as only a minor component in a larger framework of educational structures and philosophy. This larger framework, in turn, was only a part of their overall conception of man and society. Since the junior college was seldom the central focus in the thoughts of the three educators, it will be necessary to consider at some length their general views of the world and the role of education in it. Not only will this provide the needed perspective for understanding their idea of the junior college, but it will also reveal the essential social conservatism underlying their pedagogical innovations--a trait that will be characteristic of many other men in other generations who advanced the junior college idea.

---

[1] There is no general biography of Alexis F. Lange, although he is deserving of scholarly attention. One brief biographical account by W. W. Kemp appears in The Dictionary of American Biography, 1933, X, 591; Another is Henry Joseph Aigner, "Alexis Frederick Lange," an appendix in Bogue's The Community College, pp. 332-335.

The Hallmark of Efficiency

No theme is more pervasive in the writings of Harper, Jordan, and Lange than their general preoccupation for order, systematization, efficiency, and the elimination of waste. These ever present concepts were used to mean much more than simply techniques or processes which were advantageous in achieving various individual, educational, economic or social goals; rather they were advocated as goals in themselves, ends rather than means. The single term that was employed the most often to encompass all of the many virtuous ends sought by these writers was "efficiency."

In their preoccupation with efficiency, Harper, Jordan and Lange were representative of their era. Samuel Haber's study of scientific management during the Progressive Era disclosed that "efficiency" was a widely used term with several meanings: a character attribute of hard work, self-discipline, and masculinity; a productive machine; a profitable business operation; and, of particular importance during this era, it signified a harmonious relationship among men under competent leadership. Haber noted that "efficient and good came closer to meaning the same thing in these years than in any other period in American history."[1]

---

[1] Samuel Haber, Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. ix.

The meanings that Harper, Jordan, and Lange attached to "efficiency" were generally in keeping with Haber's analysis. They made consistent use of the term as a mark, often the most important mark, of individual worth, and they also applied the term, sometimes labeled "social efficiency," as the functioning of an ideal society. They wrote little about machine output or business enterprises, yet, in their discussions of educational institutions and systems, businesslike "efficiency" was a major concern. The centrality of the concept of efficiency in the thinking of Harper, Jordan, and Lange makes it important to explore their meanings carefully.

In one sense, efficiency was used to mean the "one best way" to achieve order and productivity. It resembled, in this regard, the defense of monopolies and trusts advanced by many businessmen and economists of the period, stressing the elimination of wasteful competition and the advantages of management co-ordination. In 1895, William Rainey Harper lamented the "hundred thousand disconnected parts" of American education, comparing it unfavorably with the more orderly systems of Germany and France--a commonly made comparison, and proclaimed:

> The introduction of order and system would double the efficiency of the work done, save two or four years in the life of every student, and secure a thoroughness which would revolutionize American methods in politics, business, and letters.[1]

While Harper did not advocate a specific system of education in 1895, as he was to become famous for doing later, he did identify three essential characteristics of efficiency.[2] The first was individualism, defined as a man discovering "the thing nature intended for him to do." What specialty could the individual offer to society? A second essential characteristic of the efficient system in Harper's view was co-ordination, explained in a two-page analogy of a tree and its branches, the pruning aspect not unlike John D. Rockefeller's analogy of a rose bush for the oil industry.[1] The third characteristic was association, or combination, the prominent feature of the economic scene in his day. Harper noted the use that education could make of consolidation, following the lead of business trusts, in an 1888 letter to Rockefeller:

---

[1] William Rainey Harper, "Ideals of Educational Work," NEA Journal of Proceedings, XXXIV (1895), 987-998.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 990.

> Why should not this university erected at Chicago include as an organic part of it besides the theological seminary also various colleges throughout the West? . . . And let it be a university made up of a score of colleges with a large degree of uniformity in their management; in other words, an educational trust.[2]

Harper's life-long search for efficiency, which shall be examined in more detail later, was the product of his deepest feelings and the target of his most ambitious plans. An historian of the University of Chicago stated:

> Revulsion against disorder in education and the cognate emotion of admiration for devices calculated to make education more efficient were characteristic of Harper's reaction to his world.[3]

David Starr Jordan also placed high priority on order and efficiency in his efforts for a better educational system. Jordan, whose evolutionist concepts were worked heavily, advanced the optimistic theme that "the whole movement of civilization has been from strife to order."[1] He thought that the distinguishing mark of the American university was destined to be the training of "personal efficiency" or "effectiveness." Making international comparisons, Jordan noted the ideal of the university in England was "personal culture," in France it was the achievement of ready-made careers, and in Germany it was a thoroughness of knowledge. In America, said Jordan, the ideal was quickly becoming "the power to bring about results. . . ."[2]

---

[1] Rockefeller has been often quoted for telling a Sunday school class that the Standard Oil Trust was "merely a survival of the fittest. . . . The American Beauty rose can be produced in the splendor and fragrance which bring cheer to its beholder only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it. It is merely the working-out of a law of nature and a law of God." See Eric F. Goldman, Rendezvous With Destiny (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), pp. 71-72.

[2] Letter from Harper to Rockefeller, November 15, 1888, cited in Storr, Harper's University, p. 24.

[3] Storr, Harper's University, p. 214

Alexis F. Lange was not as inclined to use a business model of efficiency as were Harper and Jordan, possibly because he was not in the occupation of seeking philanthropic grants from businessmen but more probably because, writing slightly later, he shared more of the anti-trust attitudes common to the progressive movement. But Lange did make occasional use of the business-oriented aspect of efficiency, arguing that the training of teachers did not give them the efficiency necessary to be productive, and warning universities, in terms resembling those used by more recent "accountability" advocates, that they must set measures of efficiency that can be clear and demonstrable measures of what the schools are aiming to accomplish.[3]

In the sense that efficiency meant good business--smooth running machinery and productive results--Harper, Jordan, and Lange were speaking the language of the Era of Big Business, and as such it carried the status of success and the supposed objectivity of scientific management. The writings of scientific management expert Frederick W. Taylor were serialized in popular magazines, and the national craze for efficiency was apparent from church sermons to socialist party meetings.[1] As important as the status of the business world was in determining the meaning and appeal of "efficiency," however, the concept extended even further. When we deal later with the emerging concept of the junior college, intertwined as it will be with the concept of efficiency, it would be a mistake to think only in terms of an economic production model.[2] Even in the writings of Frederick W. Taylor, the social and moral content of "efficiency" was a major component of the concept, and the educators under study here usually employed the social and moral connotations of the term rather than simply an economic one.

---

[1] David Starr Jordan, War and Waste (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1913), p. 6.

[2] David Starr Jordan, "University Tendencies in America," Popular Science Monthly, LXIII (June, 1903), 141-148.

[3] Alexis F. Lange, Some Phases of University Efficiency (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1911).

Alexis F. Lange, a professional educator of educators, was the most energetic and repetitive advocate of "social efficiency" among the trio of educators. Lange consciously, yet not always successfully, guarded against corrupting the moral meaning of "efficiency" with the taint of business rhetoric. A crime is committed against a student, maintained Lange, "if we regard him as merely an economic device, a means to a livelihood, as a tool for Capital to use and to exploit. . . ." Lange did not deny that national progress called for specialized skills, but he argued that it depended "even more on a people's general social efficiency, i.e. on the height of the plane on which the greatest possible number of citizens are able to meet in thinking, feeling, and hence willing."[1] To Lange, social efficiency was a synonym for citizenship, a type of citizenship which eliminated feelings of social class and group economic interests and fostered a spirit of unity, loyalty and co-operation in and with one's fellow man. The goal of social efficiency required the intensification and extension of public education, and this was the major factor in Lange's interest in junior colleges, as will be explored in detail later.[2]

---

[1] Samuel Haber, Efficiency and Uplift, pp. 51-65.

[2] A book by Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962) has provided a useful chronicle of the prevalent use of "efficiency" in the rhetoric of public school administrators. Noting the overwhelming extent and degree to which the cult of efficiency penetrated the ideology of the educators, Callahan concludes that they passively capitulated to the ideas of businessmen. It could be, however, that Callahan has failed to recognize the active role played by educators in creating and promoting other, non-business aspects of efficiency, a discussion of which follows.

The "social" usage of "efficiency" places it squarely in the realm of Progressive thought, the subject of extensive historical study.[3] It can be seen emanating from many non-business segments in society, from social workers to conservationists, all concerned with preserving order in a society becoming increasingly chaotic--or at least threatening chaos to the Progressives. Agreeing that order had to stem from the individual rather than the state, Harper, Jordan and Lange desired to promote "individual" efficiency, a necessary component of "social efficiency." Education, properly organized and systematized, they agreed, could replace the crumbling controls of the earlier agrarian nation in the industrial future. In 1896, David Starr Jordan expressed this goal as follows:

---

[1] Alexis F. Lange, "New Wine in New Bottles," *Manual Training Magazine*, XIX (September, 1917), 10.

[2] The relationship in Lange's thinking among social efficiency, citizenship, and the junior college are quite clear in Alexis F. Lange, "A Junior College Department of Civic Education," *School and Society*, II (September 25, 1915), 442-448.

[3] The vast literature on progressive thought defies a complete listing. General works contributing significantly to this study are: Goldman, *Rendezvous With Destiny*; Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* (New York: Vintage Books, 1956); Gabriel Kolko, *The Triumph of Conservatism* (New York: Free Press, 1963); James Weinstein, *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900-1918* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968); Morton G. White, *Social Thought in America: The Revolt Against Formalism* (New York: Viking Press, 1949); and Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1967).

> Order is more important than even freedom, and order must be uphold by force if it cannot be maintained in any other way. Yet the ideal of civilization must be perfect anarchy--order maintained from within, the recognition of order in the hearts of men; not order imposed upon men from without, but the forces within that make for righteousness of thought and action. The fruitage of civilization must be voluntary co-operation.[1]

Jordan's idea of "perfect anarchy" is difficult to fathom, but whatever he meant had no application, as far as he was concerned, to his contemporary society, which he characterized as a "crude civilization."[2] In his writings, and also those of Harper and Lange, waste and anarchy were considered the evil alternatives to efficiency and order. The human waste caused by alcohol and idleness was every bit as repugnant to these men as it was to their Puritan ancestors, although the sin was castigated in social rather than religious terms. When internal controls failed, they stood ready to apply external direction; Harper was known to march into saloons to retrieve wayward students, and Jordan suspended 132 Stanford students at one time for frequenting local taverns.[3] All the same, however, their efforts to establish "social efficiency" were aimed at the inner mind and soul of man rather than external regulations--and thus education was instrumental in their plans to ingrain social efficiency in the internal makeup of individuals.

---

[1] David Starr Jordan, The Care and Culture of Men (San Francisco: The Whitaker & Ray Co., 1896), p. 228.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Goodspeed, William Rainey Harper, pp. 41-52; Jordan, The Days of a Man, II, 252-255.

Evolution and Elitism

While Harper, Jordan, and Lange wrote as if they were apostles of democracy,[1] opening the gates of educational opportunity ever wider, their conception of democracy was certainly not one in which men were to be equals. Their elitist attitudes toward society, stemming from their beliefs on the nature of man, were essential components of their educational philosophies and practices, and their acceptance of elitism was underwritten, intellectually, by their acceptance of social Darwinism, the application of Darwinian concepts of evolution to society. There was a compatable relationship between the concept of social efficiency and social Darwinism; efficiency was often the standard of "fitness"--with all of its implications of personal character and morality--by which survival and advancement would accrue.

David Starr Jordan, a biologist, made the most frequent and direct attempts of the three to apply the Darwinian concepts of "the survival of the fittest" and "natural selection" to the development of individuals, groups, and societies. He was a self-proclaimed "evolutionist" by the age of twenty-one and repeatedly phrased his views of man and of society with references to biological evolution.[2] He was a prominent figure nationally in anti-imperialism and peace movements from the 1890's to his death in 1931, and his writings on the subject publicized the danger of war from an eugenic point of view--the probability of killing off the finest specimens of the race. Of course, war was defended by others as an age-old method of determining the survival of the fittest, and in fact--as Richard Hofstadter has clearly demonstrated--Darwinian concepts could be used to support opposite sides of most social issues, giving intellectual support to both the defenders of the status quo and its attackers.[1] Interestingly enough, Jordan used the term "Social Darwinism" in a derogatory sense to refer to beliefs that the struggle for survival, from which the fittest would emerge victoriously, could be applied to human warfare. He quoted from Darwin's writings that war was actually a reversal of the process of natural selection.[2]

---

[1] Harper proclaimed that the university acted as the priest, prophet, and philosopher for American democracy in his book, The Trend in Higher Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905), p. 12. Jordan's subtitle on his autobiography was "Being Memories of a Naturalist, Teacher and Minor Prophet of Democracy." Lange did not label himself in this spiritual role, but he did write often of the democratic "mission of the junior college." For example, see Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College--What Manner of Child Shall This Be?!," School and Society, VII (February 23, 1918), 211-216.

[2] Jordan, The Days of a Man, I, 113-114.

When Jordan viewed "the masses," his ideas of efficiency, evolution, and elitism were revealed in the greatest clarity. The inefficiencies in the use of time and techniques among the poor justly determined their plight, in Jordan's eyes. Just as plant and animal forms must inherit the tendency to master efficiently each stage of growth, since "degeneration and degradation result from loss of time," so must men efficiently perform or face the consequences. Jordan stated that he knew of few men in the social order "whose place is not fixed by their own character and training. In America to-day most men find that the position awarded them is the only one possible." Jordan found poor folks to be poor generally because of poor ways, causing "reduced vitality" and "lower morality." Resenting the burden placed upon the rest of society by the bottom ranks of the social order, Jordan warned that money given outright to these folks "is as dangerous as a gift of opium," supporting their poor ways.[1] While Jordan recognized that some of the poor were victims rather than culprits, he steadfastly maintained that most poverty was deserved:

---

[1] Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought.

[2] David Starr Jordan, War and the Breed (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1915), pp. 90-98.

> Statistics have shown that, of ten persons in distress in our great cities, the condition of six is due to intemperance, idleness or vice, three to old age and weakness following a thriftless or improvident youth, and one to sickness, accident, or loss of work. The unfortunate poor are but a small faction of the great pauperism.[2]

Jordan was an eager student of eugonics and had no doubt that mental and spiritual traits were largely inherited. He chided do-gooder reformers naive enough to believe that a slum child "has just as good a chance as one of fine family, if only it can be rescued early enough."[3] Jordan advised California teachers that their main job was to break up the masses, allowing the natural leaders to rise and training the rest "as well as we can . . . Let us make them wise, intelligent, clean, honest, thrifty."[4] William Graham Sumner, the noted American proponent of the "rugged individual" interpretation of social Darwinism,[5] was never any more direct than Jordan in condemning the **contemptible** ways of the lower classes:

> If a man puts no part of his brain and soul into his daily work--if he feels no pride in the part he is taking in life,--the sooner he leaves the world the better. His work is the work of a slave, and his life the waste of so much good oxygen. The misery he endures is nature's testimony to his worthlessness. We cannot save him from nature's penalties.[6]

---

[1] Jordan, Care and Culture, pp. 239ff. [2] Ibid., p. 247.

[3] David Starr Jordan, The Higher Foolishness (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1927), pp. 77-78.

[4] Jordan, Care and Culture, p. 17.

[5] William Graham Sumner, Folkways (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1940).

[6] Jordan, Care and Culture, pp. 59-60.

Speaking in his autobiography about the "assisted immigrants" whom he saw building slums in Australia, Jordan remarked: "Serfdom 'runs in the blood.' It is not the strength of the strong but the weakness of the weak which endangers free institutions."[1]

Jordan was not alone in his view of a society properly stratified as a result of an evolutionary struggle. William Rainey Harper, like Jordan, perceived that humanity was in a "slow and tortuous progress toward a higher civilization."[2] Also like Jordan, Harper feared that their contemporary society was threatened by the weak:

> Thus far democracy seems to have found no way of making sure that the strongest men should be placed in control of the country's business. Men confessedly weak, whose private business has been a failure, are too frequently the men who are intrusted with the nation's affairs.[3]

Harper believed that it was the weight of the multitude that rendered progress slow, and he dismissed any view of man granting innate intelligence to the masses:

> No advocate of democracy today would accept Rousseau's opinion that the people have in themselves an innate and instinctive wisdom. All will agree with Lord Arthur Russell that "the multiplicity of ignorance does not give wisdom."[4]

If the multitude was holding progress back, then the forward moving force was a minority; in Harper's view that minority force consisted of the top minds in business, education, and government. Alexis F. Lange, again more cautious than the others not to betray democratic beliefs, did not deride the masses nor cringe at the weak, but he did accept the necessity of evolutionary change--calling upon universities, in the name of efficiency, to be neither standpatters nor revolutionists, but rather "practical evolutionist(s)." By this, Lange meant that the university should direct progress:

---

[1] Jordan, The Days of a Man, II, 242.

[2] Harper, The Trend in Higher Education, p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 31. [4] Ibid., p. 9.

> . . . no progress is possible if a university tries merely to satisfy a popular demand, instead of endeavoring to discover what is needed and then to persuade the older as well as the younger generation of contemporaries to want what they need.[1] (Emphasis added.)

Strongly influenced by the writings of Lester Frank Ward,[2] Lange thought social evolution had to be neither as slow nor as tortuous as did Jordan and Harper. Problem-solving, involving man's faculty most advanced in the evolution of the species--intelligence, he thought, could be achieved for the individual and for the society through the interaction of thought and action. Like Dewey, and unlike Harper and Jordan, Lange concentrated on the immediate "process" of problem-solving, not a past or future state in long-range evolutionary development. Lange's elitism also differed from Harper and Jordan in that the elite was determined not by blood nor by competitive superiority, but instead they emerged as indistinguishable members of a group of "citizens" who shared attitudes of co-operation, action, loyalty and social efficiency which guaranteed morality and progress.[3]

Before turning to an individual consideration of the particular ideas of Harper, Jordan, and Lange, in which the concepts of efficiency, evolutionary progress, and elite leadership will be further discussed, it may be timely to mention a point of omission. Omitted from the common intellectual underpinnings of the three educators in this analysis has been the influence of the German university upon American educational developments. Considering the strong emphasis placed upon this influence by Brubacher and Rudy, Rudolph, and Veysey, a special explanation is in order.[1] It is true that Harper, Jordan, and Lange often drew upon the German system of education to exemplify a system geared to efficiency and order. They found the German system of higher education closest to the system that they envisioned for America. However, unlike Tappan and Folwell in the previous century, all three made a special point of the fact that the German system of education should not be imported intact into the United States.

---

[1] Lange, University Efficiency, pp. 4-5.

[2] Searching through Lange's personal papers, Gallager found extensive notes, in Lange's handwriting, taken from Ward's Dynamic Sociology and Outlines of Sociology. Edward A. Gallagher, "From Tappan to Lange: Evolution of the Public Junior College Idea" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968), p. 123.

[3] All of Lange's writings reflect his interest in preparing this special type of "citizen," although he is vague on the types of individuals that can be so prepared. See Lange, "Department of Civic Education;" and "Teachers for Democracy," Chapter XX in The Lange Book (San Francisco: Trade Publishing Company, 1927), pp. 193-202.

Jordan thought that the qualities of independence and self-reliance possessed by Americans, distinguishing them from Germans, dictated that the German system could not, and should not, be implemented in the United States. Lange criticized German educators for stressing science to the point of neglecting an "artistic" element in knowledge, overlooking a basic need in human development. Harper's concern for close attention to character-building and personal relationships between faculty and students, leading him to build dormitories at Chicago and to establish a system of warm "cluster" colleges, on the Oxford model, was a fundamental deviation from the German model. All three men openly disapproved of the undemocratic structure of German society and generally qualified their use of the German model of Education by stating that the United States had both the need and potential for a different and better system of efficiency led by men of intelligence.[1]

---

[1] References to the extensive German influence on American higher education are dispersed throughout Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition; Rudolph, The American College and University; and, to a lesser degree, Veysey, The Emergence of the American University.

The lesser influence of the German model of education upon the thinking of Harper, Jordan, and Lange than upon other American leaders in higher education (assuming that Brubacher and Rudy, Rudolph, and Veysey were correct in their assessment), may simply be because none of the three subjects in this study did extensive graduate study in a German university.[2] But it is also quite likely, and this writer suggests that this possibility needs to be explored through further research, that the constant references to the German system of education throughout the literature of higher education do not reflect the idealization of the German system as much as they illustrate, for lack of a better model, the deeper concerns in America for domestic order and efficiency.

William Rainey Harper

William Rainey Harper's basic ideas on education, naturally stemming from his general view of man and society, were not at all original; they had been clearly expressed a generation before in the writings of Tappan and Folwell. But Harper was the first university president, backed with adequate financial resources, to launch an ambitious and comprehensive effort to transform the ideas into practice, and as a result of this effort the junior college, only one of many ensuing results, was boosted toward its destiny.

---

[1] Jordan, Care and Culture, p. 55; Alexis F. Lange, "The Course for Training Secondary School Teachers," The Sierra Educational News, XV (October, 1919), 509; Storr, Harper's University, pp. 164-165ff.

[2] Of the three subjects, only Lange attended a German university, and his attendance there was less than one year.

While Harper viewed the entire educational system as an organic, evolving system, congruent with his beliefs about efficiency and evolution, his focus was on the university, which he saw as both the highest institutional form present in the society as well as the guiding light for future evolution. The superior role that such an institution should be expected to play in society is stated by Harper this way:

> Democracy has been given a mission to the world, and it is of no uncertain character. I wish to show that the university is the prophet of this democracy and, as well, its priest and its philosopher; that, in other words, the university is the Messiah of the democracy, its to-be-expected deliverer.[1]

Harper's clerical analogies signified more than his scholarly interest in biblical literature; he clearly had a moralistic role in mind for the university, in large part as a moral leader for the masses. Harper wrote depressingly of the multitudes in cities who were of no worth to themselves or society, posing a possible threat of revolution or socialism (nearly identical threats to Harper), but he optimistically assured his readers that the university could discover a doctrine of "national righteousness" which would allow democratic progress to continue. This would be a doctrine the multitudes could be taught, although it would be on too high of a plane to expect them to grasp it without help. The university as the "prophet of democracy," states Harper, would provide that assistance. Convinced that the "popular mind" would never be able to formulate "national righteousness," only follow it, Harper asserted:

> The popular mind will not be able to do this service. The prophet, whose discerning eye reads the thought in the heart of democracy itself, expressed in the heartthrobs

---

[1] Harper, The Trend in Higher Education, p. 12.

> reaching to the very depths of human experience--the prophet, I say, will then formulate the teaching which will make earth indeed a paradise.[1]

With such a lofty conception of the university, it is not surprising that Harper viewed the remainder of the educational system primarily as a method of preparing students for the university, on the one hand, and distributing to the populace the doctrine of national righteousness, on the other hand. Neither is it surprising that Harper envisioned the university itself as playing the key role in shaping the structures and policies of other institutions of education. Harper had firm ideas on how elementary schools, high schools, and colleges should be efficiently organized and what they should be doing.

Elementary schools were guilty of wasting time and effort, two cardinal sins in Harper's view of morality. Their proper concern was citizenship training, and not the introduction of scientific subjects in the seventh and eighth years, subjects better and more efficiently taught by scientifically trained high school teachers. Harper recommended, in line with the NEA Committee of Ten report some years earlier, cutting the length of elementary school years to six, plus a kindergarten year, and he included these recommendations in the report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago, which he chaired.[2]

The time saved by cutting two years off elementary education, added to that saved by altering colleges (to be considered next) could be well spent, according to Harper's scheme, added to the high school. High Schools were emerging institutions at the turn of the century, and their struggle for identity was not unlike the present condition of community-junior colleges.[1] In 1900, the number of high school graduates amounted to only 6.4 percent of the seventeen-year-old population in the United States.[2] The high schools themselves competed for students and public support with various types of academies, college preparatory departments, and even colleges willing to take any student who could pay the fees. The diversity of institutions and the lack of any common standards between elementary and university education produced a chaotic situation that was an anathema to disciples of efficiency.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17.

[2] Report of the Educational Commission of the City of Chicago (Chicago: R. R. Donnelloy & Sons, 1898). David Starr Jordan, incidentally, served as one of the advisers to this commission.

Harper viewed the chaotic gap in the educational years between the elementary school and the university with disdain. Everything within him calling for order, efficiency, progress, and clear leadership led him to work zealously for a system congruent with his beliefs. The high school would eventually evolve, Harper predicted, as the unifying, scientifically organized institution that would provide the efficiency needed in the educational system. It would take a child from the elementary school about age thirteen and develop fully his knowledge of a broad range of general subjects. At nineteen or twenty, the student would have reached personal maturity and have gained the general background necessary to enter a professional school or specialized study at the university. This was the point in a student's life that came between the sophomore and junior years in college, and efficiency demanded that the educational system adjust itself to that fact.

---

[1] The similarities in the early development of the high schools and the more recent development of community-junior colleges are striking. The rationale of the two movements stressing the needs of the economy, the democratization of education, and the development of citizenship are expressed in very much the same way. High schools were often referred to as "people's colleges," a term commonly applied to community-junior colleges today. As much as community-junior colleges are an extension of secondary education, these similarities are logical enough. For this reason, history of the origins of the high school movement offer precious insights into the origins of community-junior colleges. Especially helpful are: Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School; and Theodore R. Sizer, Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964). These sources, unfortunately, contain no substantial account of the early origin of community-junior colleges.

[2] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 207.

[3] See Sizer, Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century, pp. 18-36ff.

Despite Harper's concern for the proper organization of the educational years between elementary and higher education, he was not insistent, like Alexis F. Lange later, that the high school exist in three parts--the junior high school, the high school, and the junior college. Whether the high school be one institution or divided into two or more sub-units was not Harper's concern; his concern was only that education between the elementary years and the university show an efficient, organic unity. While Harper wrote mostly of the advantage of this organization for students heading for the university and professional schools, he also mentioned from time to time that the re-structured high school would add a higher level of general culture for the masses. Thus Harper proposed that the high school of the future be for all of the people, but emphasized in particular that it channel able students efficiently toward higher scholarly and professional pursuits.[1]

In Harper's scheme of things, there was little place for the college except as a possible capstone for secondary education. The traditional American college, adapted from earlier English model and consisting of four years of general studies which overlapped those being taught in the new high schools, was, to Harper's mind, wasteful and inefficient. Except for those colleges that could make the difficult and expensive transition into universities (which Harper thought would only be a minor fraction of those colleges presuming to call themselves universities) and the larger number of small colleges that would choose the wise course of survival (which meant to Harper ridding themselves of their pretensions of offering junior and senior years) of converting into junior colleges, Harper predicted the worst consequences. All of the colleges that had sprouted in the 19th century, nourished by religious and geographical competition, Harper thought were bound for extinction. Harper did not share the nostalgia of many alumni of small colleges, although he was one himself, for the alleged superior and virtuous education available only in small colleges. He countered the arguments that small colleges offered more personal attention and liberal education by charging that they could afford to hire only the weakest men and permitted low academic standards. Worst of all, they were wasteful. Their inevitable extinction, succumbing in the struggle for existence to the stronger forces of the high school and the university, was not to be mourned; but accepted and understood as an upward step toward order and efficiency.[1]

---

[1] William Rainey Harper, "The High School of the Future," School Review, XI (January, 1903), 1-3.

As part of his campaign to eliminate the anarchic condition prevailing in American colleges, Harper invited national university leaders to Chicago in 1900 with the idea of seeking greater consistency in higher degrees and raising the standards of weaker institutions. Out of this meeting came the Association of American Universities.[2] The university delegates who assembled in Chicago heard Harper propose the "associate degree" as one appropriate for the smaller, weaker colleges, referring to the need for small colleges to "associate" with universities. According to Harper's correspondence, Presidents David Starr Jordan of Stanford and Benjamin I. Wheeler of California were the most enthusiastic about the idea. Charles Eliot of Harvard opposed it, however, fearing that it would hurt the bachelor's degree, and the delegates took no action on the matter.[1]

---

[1] William Rainey Harper, The Prospects of the Small College (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900).

[2] Storr, Harper's University, pp. 329-330.

Harper would have no part of proposals to save the small colleges since he was convinced that their demise was necessary and justifiable. When a proposal, based on Charles W. Eliot's suggestions, to reduce the length of time necessary to receive a baccalaureate degree from four to three years was debated at the 1903 convention of the National Educational Association, Harper stood firmly in opposition to it. He attacked the mistaken assumption that college work can be considered the beginning of university work, arguing as always that the freshman and sophomore years are of the same "scope and character" of preceding academy or high school work. The high schools were already doing college work, maintained Harper, and, with greater efficiency in the elimination of waste in the elementary years allowing the high schools more time, they could do even more. He accepted the argument of college proponents that "cultural" education should not stop at the sophomore year, but countered that in the specialized study of the university and the professional school there was much of a cultural nature to be gained.[2] As we turn to a consideration of Harper's activities at the University of Chicago, it will be apparent that the four-year colleges, some of which were forced to close or convert to junior colleges because of financial pressures, were by no means ready to join the great plan for educational unity which Harper proposed: the grand scheme of affiliation and association that he called "The American System," based on "co-ordination, specialization, and association."[1]

---

[1] Cited in Gallagher, "From Tappan to Lange," pp. 89-90.

[2] William Rainey Harper, "Length of the Baccalaureate Course," NEA Journal of Proceedings, XLII (1903), pp. 504-509.

When a man sets out to build his ideas into a workable institution, it is inevitable that they emerge altered in some degree from their original purpose. Other men step into positions of influence in the institution and consciously or unconsciously merge their ideas into the philosophy and operations of the institution. The limits of resources and the power of established traditions tend to pull the ideal toward the ordinary. Few men have had the singular power to shape a university as did William Rainey Harper in Chicago,[2] yet the inescapable fate of institutionalized ideas made that institution less than the realization of his educational plan. A full account of Harper's fifteen years as president of the University of Chicago would have to include, among other things, a lengthy discussion of Harper's diplomatic use of crises to extract more and more money from John D. Rockefeller, the competitive manner in which Harper acquired the university staff, the use of the quarter system, and the development of extension services. But none of these developments really implemented the basic goal which Harper envisioned--an efficient educational trust.[1]

---

[1] William Rainey Harper, "The Trend of University and College Education in the United States," North American Review, CLXXIV (April, 1902), 457-465.

[2] Despite Rockefeller's handsome gifts to the University of Chicago, beginning with a modest $600,000 in 1889 but totaling $16,000,000 by 1916, he did not restrict Harper's actions in any significant way. See Allan Nevins, John D. Rockefeller: The Heroic Age of American Enterprise (2 vols.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940), II, 260-261. Also see Rudolph, The American College and University, pp. 349-352.

Harper's primary inspiration, his vision of an educational trust with the University of Chicago acting as the co-ordinator and controlling agent, never materialized. After ten years, only six institutions of higher education had affiliated with the university.[2] Three of these were Baptist colleges undoubtedly willing to comply with the interests of the American Baptist Educational Society which, with Rockefeller's financial support, also underwrote Harper's educational designs. One was a polytechnic institute and another was a medical school, leaving only one private liberal arts college, Butler College, which was willing to be included in Harper's educational trust.[3] Considering Harper's unsympathetic view of the dismal prospects for small colleges, it is hardly surprising that they would choose not to submit to his direction. Measured against the success of the University patron's consolidation of the oil industry, Harper's attempted affiliation with midwestern colleges was an utter failure.

---

[1] For an alternative interpretation see Gould, The Chautauqua Movement. Gould argues from circumstantial evidence that Harper's experience in the Chautaqua movement carried over directly to the University of Chicago, and that the extension service was one significant result of Harper's commitment to the Chautauqua idea. But support for this argument is not to be found in Harper's own writings, which seldom mention the extension service of a university and never really advocate it. On the contrary, those functions below specialized research are generally disowned by Harper as true functions of a research university. Since the research methodology used in this study did not substantiate Gould's conclusions, neither Harper's Chautauqua experience nor the extension service at the University of Chicago have been singled out for special attention.

[2] "Affiliation" was a term meaning policy agreements with non-public institutions whereby the University reviewed course materials and examinations and sometimes advised on the hiring of staff members; "co-operation" specifically applied to public high schools and arrangements, often by accrediting individual teachers, to facilitate the transfer of students to the university.

[3] Storr, Harper's University, p. 219.

But Harper's belief in the desirability of bringing order, control, and efficiency to higher education did not weaken after ten years of failure. Nothing was more central to his philosophy nor more consistent in his actions than the idea of an orderly system, on a grand scale, inspired and directed by a superior university, his University at Chicago. In his report on the University's first decade of operation, Harper rededicated himself and his institution to the grand design. He admitted that small colleges looked upon affiliation more as absorbtion than assistance, an attitude he mistakenly attributed to the meaning of the term itself. He attempted to allay the fears of small colleges by stating, in contradiction to his earlier writings, that the "greatest calamity which could possibly befall the cause of higher education in the United States would be the extinction, or even a considerable deterioration, of the small college."[1] Evolution was a slow process, so Harper could easily rationalize the necessity of intermediate stages, as he did in this case.

The tenth year of University operations also occasioned Harper's boldest and clearest attempt to win support for his ideas from other educational leaders. Each year, sometimes twice a year, after 1891, Harper invited representatives from midwestern high schools, colleges, and other post-high school institutions to a conference at the University to discuss educational programs. At the 1902 Conference, Harper placed before the delegates his proposal to curtail educational duplication and waste through efficient reorganization. The message was familiar: shorten the elementary school period to six years; extend the high school years both downward, to begin the study of general knowledge and culture earlier, and upward, to complete the task of general learning which ordinarily occurs up to the sophomore level in college. The strategy, however, was new: a Commission of Twenty-One was created at the Conference to study the proposed educational reorganization. The Commission was subdivided into three committees of Seven assigned to study elementary, secondary, and college reorganization respectively and charged to report to the following year's conference.[1] This renewed effort by Harper, three years before his death, bore witness to the depth and durability of his basic educational goal of an efficient and orderly system of American education.

---

[1] William Rainey Harper, "The President's Report: Administration," in The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1903), pp. lxvi-lxvii.

The reports of the three committees to the 1903 Conference were not all that Harper wished them to be. The committee studying elementary school reorganization did accept the idea of shortening the length of time, but it recommended seven years instead of Harper's six. Furthermore, the report contained a warning that the elementary years should not be altered merely for the sake of furthering secondary education, and the committee expressed its concern, absent from Harper's ideas, for the smooth transition from elementary to secondary education. The influence of John Dewey's advice to the delegates could be seen in their report. Dewey supported Harper's efforts to shorten the span of elementary education and lengthen that of secondary education, but he had warned the conference delegates that mere mechanical changes without considering worthy objects of study and modes of activity in education were not enough. He agreed with Harper that the aim of elementary education was not knowledge and that six years should be long enough, if the work be done properly, to achieve its real aim--"organizing the instincts and impulses of children into working interests and tools."[1] He was concerned, however, that the Conference should give greater consideration to the substance of elementary education rather than just its form.[2] By recommending seven years of elementary education and underscoring the intrinsic value of elementary education, the committee proposed a compromise between Harper's ideas and defenders of an eight year elementary period, a compromise passed on to the Conference by a split four to three vote.[3]

---

[1] William Rainey Harper, "The General Conference," School Review, XII (January, 1904), 15-28.

The committee on secondary schools, chaired by J. Stanley Brown, Harper's friend and the founder of Joliet Junior College, supported Harper's recommendations in full. A five to two vote allowed that committee to report in favor of six years of secondary education, taking a student directly from the elementary school and raising him to a level of knowledge and general culture equivalent to the sophomore year in college, that point at which the committee agreed with Harper that the student could begin his role as a citizen or a specialized student at a university or in a professional school.[4]

The committee on colleges made no recommendation, but their report failed to support Harper's conviction that the dividing line between college and university work should be crystal clear and institutionally structured. The committee did report that a six-year high school containing two additional years of general culture could meet the need of "a class of youth that has arisen out of the concentration of population in our cities," but hastened to add that the traditional four-year college, with its special collegiate atmosphere, was an important institution to protect. The solicited views of nearby college presidents were included in the report, and they generally stressed the advantages of a four-year college experience and expressed doubts that the high schools, poor in facilities and staff, would ever be able to replace or duplicate the work of the colleges.[1]

---

[1] John Dewey, "Shortening the Years of Elementary Schools," School Review, XI (January, 1903), 17.

[2] Ibid., 17-20; John Dewey, "Current Problems in Secondary Schools," School Review, X (January, 1902), 17-18.

[3] Harper, "The General Conference," pp. 15-19. [4] Ibid., pp. 19-22.

Harper expected greater support for his ideas from the three committees, especially since most of the members were from the University faculty or from affiliating and co-operating schools, and thus could be assumed to be receptive to Harper's ideas. After the 1903 Conference, the Commission of Twenty-One was charged as a single body to study further the reorganization proposal under the chairmanship of Harper himself. This offered a chance for Harper to marshall more evidence in support of his plan. He arranged for the Commission to hear Superintendent W.B. Hedgepeth of Goshen, Indiana, speak glowingly of the newly created six-year high school in his city. J. Stanley Brown, Joliet's superintendent, spoke enthusiastically about his junior college, then in the second year of operation. In spite of Harper's efforts, assisted by Hedgepeth and Brown, the Commission of Twenty-One, after two years of study, recommended nothing more than that a new Commission of Fifteen be appointed to carry out a thorough investigation of Harper's reorganization plan; they did not feel that they had enough evidence to take any firm stand themselves on the matter.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-26.

[2] William Rainey Harper, "Report of the Commission of Twenty-One," *School Review*, XIII (January, 1905), 23-24.

Thus Harper's singular aim of an efficiently organized educational system was thwarted again; the University of Chicago Conferences never developed the support for his ideas that he intended, and he died in 1906 without the satisfaction of building his educational trust. The conferences were themselves abandoned in 1911.

There was, of course, one facet of Harper's design that, in a manner of speaking, did come to fruition and has afforded him the title of "Father of the Junior College Movement." It is important to remember that junior colleges were but one element in Harper's overall plan for systematization; although he registered some success in the institutionalization of this idea, he never separated it in his own mind from the broader reorganizational reforms which he never achieved. It was the strength of the idea, not the actual results of his labors, that stands as Harper's main contribution to the development of junior colleges.

The concept of the junior college emerged in Harper's thinking from the same evolutionary struggle that he believed destined the university to superiority and most small colleges to extinction. Harper pictured the junior college more as a transitory institution than as one which would survive the struggle in a transcendent form, such as the university would. In fact, Harper's idea of a junior college was not a single type of an institution; it could be a former four-year college led by an honest appraisal of its offerings, or forced by financial realities, to limit its program to two years; it might be the thirteenth and fourteenth years appended to an existing high school; it could possibly be a teacher-training or pre-professional school; it could even be, as it was at Chicago, the first two years of education in a university, if separately organized. All it had to be was a place where instruction was offered which was of the same nature as that typically offered to freshmen and sophomores in larger colleges and universities, and further it had to recognize that this instruction marked the natural division between a general and a specialized program of study.[1] At times in Harper's writings he states that this place should naturally be the secondary school, but at other times, when he realizes the slow process of evolution and the existing defensiveness of traditional colleges, the place appears as the freshman and sophomore years anywhere, even within the weak colleges whose pretensions Harper generally challenged. But these details did not especially concern Harper because he viewed the junior college really as a means to an end, and not as an end in itself. It was the means of transforming pre-university education into the orderly, systematic, and efficient format that was but one part in the overall design for educational efficiency that was Harper's dream and his life's work.

Where Harper saw the greatest immediate need for the junior college idea in his society was in regard to small colleges. His own experience in teaching at an institution that was a college only in name, offering the most basic general courses to young boys, had been an extreme disappointment, and he resented the pretenses of "lower" institutions that they were doing the "higher" work. He claimed that over 200 so-called colleges in the nation lacked the finances, staffing, and facilities to offer any instruction beyond the sophomore year.[2] Harper offered six reasons for small colleges, stated in terms of their own interests, to accept his advice to reduce their offerings to two years:

---

[1] Harper, The Prospects of the Small College, pp. 34-39.

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

> 1. The money now wasted in doing the higher work superficially could be used to do the lower work more thoroughly.
>
> 2. The pretense of giving a college education would be given up, and the college could become an honest institution.
>
> 3. The student who was not really fitted by nature to take the higher work could stop naturally and honorably at the end of the sophomore year.
>
> 4. Many students who might not have the courage to enter upon a course of four years' study would be willing to do the two years of work before entering business or the professional school.
>
> 5. Students capable of doing the higher work would be forced to go away from the small college to the university. This change would in every case be most advantageous.
>
> 6. Students living near the college whose ambition it was to go away to college could remain at home until greater maturity had been reached--a point of the highest moment in these days of strong temptation.[1]

It has not been established that Harper had any direct influence through the forces of his arguments in convincing any small colleges to their proper role as junior colleges. Some of the first to do so, including the three considered to be the first self-proclaimed junior colleges,[2] were Baptist colleges, and it is possible that the Baptist circles that Harper operated in carried his ideas with some effectiveness. It is also possible that Frederick T. Gates, the corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Education Society, who became Rockefeller's primary adviser concerning educational philanthropy, and who was receptive to Harper's thinking,[3] played a role in making these institutions junior colleges.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[2] Tyrus Hillway, *The American Two-Year College* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 39.

[3] See Storr, *Harper's University*, pp. 9-42.

The creation of junior colleges by secondary systems was something that Harper advocated and expected, but he did not give the need as high a priority as reducing the number of small colleges. This is perhaps because the plight of the many small colleges was immediate and the promise of secondary education was still based largely on future potential. As mentioned earlier, the high school was still a relatively new institution at the turn of the century, and many educators were having difficulty convincing communities that they should support four years of additional public schooling, not to mention six. Also, Harper's goal did not require high schools to set up, in a formal and single step, an actual institutional division called a junior college. He was content to see high schools offer, as a beginning, a course or two which were equivalent to respective college courses, and he assumed that the 13th and 14th years would gradually and naturally evolve.[1]

In The Prospects of the Small College, Harper cited the success of the neighboring state of Michigan, the minimum cost, and the possibility of increasing the numbers of students with greater education as reasons for extending the high school an additional year or two. Reporting that only 10 percent of high school graduates went to college in 1900, Harper predicted that the percentage would rise to forty if secondary schools offered the opportunity.[1]

---

[1] Some high schools were sending students on to college with advanced standing as early as the 1880's, and the University of Michigan made a concerted effort in this direction in the 1890's. See Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, pp. 164-165; Hillway, The American Two-Year College, p. 36. Students from Joliet high school had been transferring to the University of Chicago with advanced standing since 1894; a controversy over the date of the founding of Joliet Junior College results from the fact that Chicago accepted a number of Joliet students in 1901 as full juniors but the Joliet Board of Trustees did not officially acknowledge the existence of a junior college connected with the high school until 1902. See Robert S. Smolich, "An Analysis of Influences Affecting the Origin and Early Development of Three Mid-Western Public Junior Colleges--Joliet, Goshen, and Crane" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1967), pp. 60-61ff.

One salient fact that has boosted Harper's image as the father of the junior college movement is the founding of Joliet Junior College, the oldest continuously operating public junior college in the nation. The proximity of Joliet to Chicago, and the status of its high school as a co-operating school with the University of Chicago since 1899, suggest the probability of Harper's influence at work. Furthermore, J. Stanley Brown, Joliet's superintendent, was Harper's friend and his colleague at Baptist conventions, and his support for Harper's ideas in the Commission of Twenty-One has already been noted. All the same, Harper's role in the founding of Joliet Junior College has been largely assumed, and there are important reasons why the assumption needs to be questioned. Harper did not play any direct role before the public of Joliet nor before the Board of Trustees in gaining support for the junior college; indeed, there is no record of his ever visiting Joliet's high school or junior college. Board minutes indicate that a new high school building, built over capacity, was a major factor in establishing the junior college. The willingness of the University of Chicago to accept junior college transfers can be discounted as a fundamental factor in the development of the junior college since many more advanced placement students, including transfers into the junior year, went from Joliet to the University of Illinois at Urbana than to the University of Chicago. Moreover, J. Stanley Brown should not be dismissed as a minor figure in Harper's shadow. He promoted many of his own thoughts in educational journals and eventually went on to the presidency of Illinois State Normal School at DeKalb.[1]

---

[1] Harper, The Prospects of the Small College, p. 39.

The serious exaggeration that has occurred as a result of Harper's real or alleged role in the founding of Joliet Junior College is less significant as a matter of fact than it is in distorting a balanced historical perspective. Tying Harper's involvement in the junior college inextricably with Joliet Junior College tends to obscure the broader framework of his ideas and the driving forces which explain much about his society and his educational design.

The history of an early public junior college at Goshen, Indiana, further illustrates that Harper's influence on junior college development was mostly indirect, although it would be easy to assume the opposite. Beginning at roughly the same time as Joliet Junior College, the Junior College at Goshen had only a decade of existence (1901-1911). Started by Superintendent W. B. Hedgepeth, who, like Brown, was actively involved in the University of Chicago Conferences, Goshen Junior College, in contrast to Joliet, which attracted little attention initially, was launched with much local publicity and fanfare--yet Harper's name was not prominent in the publicity. In fact, the University of Chicago caused Hedgepeth some embarrassment by cautiously reviewing Goshen's claims of doing college work and not granting full approval until 1905. Hedgepeth, who had been a zealous promoter of the junior college, left the Goshen superintendency in 1906. Without Hedgepeth's promoting efforts, an enrollment decline in the junior college occurred and the junior college was abolished in 1911.[1] The evidence of Harper's personal involvement in Goshen's rise and decline is again more circumstantial than direct; circumstantially, the death of Harper in 1906 could be assumed a factor in the failure of Goshen Junior College. These are interesting questions which should someday be answered, but they are not central to an understanding of Harper's multi-faceted involvement in the broader concept of the junior college which was so basic to his thinking.

---

[1] The factual information in this paragraph is from Smolich, "Three Midwestern Junior Colleges," pp. 95-99ff. J. Stanley Brown, in The Growth and Development of Junior Colleges in the United States, U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 19 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1922), p. 27, did concede credit to the visionary leadership of Harper, but a thorough search through all of Harper's correspondence by Brown's successor uncovered no documentation that Harper made any direct contribution to the establishment of Joliet Junior College. See Lewis W. Smith, "Founding of Early Junior Colleges--President Harper's Influence," Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 518.

Harper's junior college idea did directly affect the internal organization of the University of Chicago. At the outset, in 1892, the various colleges within the university--Liberal Arts, Literature, Science, and Practical Arts--were each divided into lower and upper levels; the lower levels offering freshman and sophomore courses were called the "academic colleges" until 1896, when they were re-labelled the "junior colleges"; the upper levels, offering what Harper thought to be true university work, were called the "university colleges" until 1896, when they became the "senior colleges." While this organization was perfectly in accord with Harper's ideas, it never operated with the sharp distinction between junior and senior work that existed in Harper's mind. From the first day of operation, many professors allowed lower level students into their university level courses, and many upper level students sought instruction in what were supposed to be lower level courses. The many different requirements of various academic departments were always in a state of flux, making little effort to conform to Harper's simplistic idea about a sharp line of division between college and university work. Some students found that they had to spend more than two years acquiring all of the necessary courses required by their junior college and the department into which they were heading. University-wide controversies about what should be required in the way of general knowledge in the junior colleges (for example, a decade of debate over the Latin requirement) added even more confusion to Harper's plan.[1] Despite the practical realities of course requirements and staffing that blurred the distinction between junior colleges and university colleges within the university, Harper continued to work for institutional order. In 1900 he persuaded the Faculty and Trustees to grant an Associate Degree to students completing work in the junior colleges. In explaining the value of the degree, Harper reiterated his familiar case that this would offer a natural terminal point for students desiring a complete general education but who were not really competent for higher scholarly effort, that professional schools and university departments would receive better students, and that universities could someday cast off this lower work leaving it in the hands of extended high schools and those colleges that would offer the associate degree.[2] Also listed as a major advantage of the associate degree was the point that many more students would be encouraged to undertake two additional years of college work, striking a democratic note that has seldom since been missing in community-junior college ideology. But this democratic element in Harper's argument did not really conflict with the elitism at the core of his philosophy, for only four percent of American college aged youth were in college in 1900,[1] too low a percentage even by Harper's elitist standards. Further, since the University was the place where the elite would gather, the democratization of secondary education to train the masses would not be cheapening the standards of higher education.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 129-163.

---

[1] Storr, Harper's University, pp. 113-126.

[2] William Rainey Harper, "The Associate Degree," Educational Review, XIX (April, 1900), 412-415.

The associate degree proved to be another paper division between junior and senior colleges; the departments continued to alter their requirements and courses without making Harper's distinction between general secondary education and specialized university knowledge, and individual students continued to have weaknesses in general subjects and strengths in specialized subjects which confounded the system. Meanwhile, the faculty continued to argue about the general requirements of the junior colleges. A commission was formed in 1902 under the chairmanship of George E. Vincent, Dean of the Junior Colleges, to try to bring order and greater flexibility into the junior college system. It reported in 1905 recommending fewer specified subjects and more student choice from concentrated groups of subjects.[2]

The year before his death Harper launched an ambitious reorganization of the junior colleges, incorporating suggestions of the commission and some new ideas of his own. Along with his repeated attempts to make affiliation and co-operation with other schools and colleges work, Harper's continual efforts to see the proper line drawn between junior and senior work at the University of Chicago stands as strong evidence for the over-arching importance he assigned to efficient reorganization as a panacea for the educational world. His plan, put into effect in the fall of 1905, provided for eight separate junior colleges, each limited to 175 students and having its own dean, faculty, and "distinctive character." There would be a junior college for men and another for women in each of four academic areas: Arts, Literature, Philosophy, and Science. While general regulations for all junior colleges would come from all faculty, each college was to be free to adopt its own procedures within those limits. Realizing that freshman and sophomore students would and could take some specialty courses and that junior, senior, and graduate students likewise could profit from a general course now and then, Harper's 1905 plan allowed junior college students to take up to fifty percent of their work outside their college, and it further allowed a student so inclined to remain a member of his junior college group until taking a Bachelor's degree. The junior college was to be the academic and communal home of the college student, and the University of Chicago received premature publicity that it was transplanting the Oxford idea to Chicago. Actually, the major reorganization had minimal impact: little was made available in the way of new facilities; the faculties did not form the intimate atmosphere sought; and the curricula students took continued to defy attempts for orderly groupings.[1]

---

[1] Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, p. 262.

[2] Storr, Harper's University, pp. 324-326.

Even had Harper lived beyond 1906 it is unlikely that this organizational attempt, any more than his other organizational schemes, would have resulted in the sweeping educational reform that he sought. Harper encountered many of the pitfalls that mutilate and deactivate ideas in the process of institutionalization. Nothing, not the influence he possibly had in establishing junior colleges at Joliet and Goshen, nor his direct efforts within the University of Chicago, came close to accomplishing the social efficiency that Harper had in mind. To concentrate on his public works to the exclusion of his system of ideas would be to lose the greater part of his educational ideas. To remember Harper primarily as the father of the community-junior college movement and as a democratizer of higher education would be a serious distortion of history. For the sake of accuracy, an efficient trait Harper greatly admired, we need to remember also his beliefs about social stratification and the role of education in determining one's place in life.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 326-327.

Harper's need for order and efficiency, a system of smooth-working parts, signified much more than an administrator's interest in the machinery of higher education. As outlined in the beginning of this chapter, it was a central idea in the minds of those determined both to insure the evolutionary progress of the nation and to prevent back-sliding toward the meaner instincts of human nature. The view of society was essentially elitist, for the planning and guiding of social evolution had to be left to those men whose fitness determined their rise to top positions in society. These beliefs were a secular version of Calvinism in which the masses were seen as a continual threat of evil in the long evolutionary struggle toward a better society. Harper clearly labored under these assumptions for a society of structure, order, and harmony.

Harper was in Chicago at a time of obvious social unrest. Close at hand were the unsettling eruptions of the Pullman strike and the Haymarket Square riot. Harper did not speak out directly about these events, but his general pronouncements reveal his conservative stance. Harper expressed concern that popular education, in which he included newspapers, magazines, lectures, etc., might be stimulating new ways of viewing problems and encouraging new actions without giving the people the grasp of fundamentals that would prevent them from supporting radical programs. Harper hastened to add that co-operative and intelligent change was good and necessary, but he feared that the masses, without greater "ethical training" might support an overthrow of existing institutions on the basis of superficial learning. Harper called for "stronger and higher principles of ethics" to be taught by popular education in order to correct for its tendency to stimulate ideas might unsettle society. Such "principles" were patriotism, respect for authority, the values of capitalism, etc.[1] Harper interpreted the discontent of the masses as a demand for clearness in their thinking and moral guidelines for their actions rather than a complaint of physical suffering:

> We feel it (the need for moral guidance) in every cry that comes from the heart of the masses; for these are not the instinctive cries of animals suffering pain; they are rather prayers going forth to heaven from souls whose faith, though perhaps clouded, is nevertheless strong and sincere.[2]

Harper's pro-big business attitudes also were a part of his basic social outlook. His model for a successful university was that of an industrial trust, a model he used more consistently than the model of a German university. Harper's communication with Rockefeller, noted previously, directly stated his ideal of an "educational trust." Harper reported to the University trustees that Chicago had "more of the character of a Railroad Company or an Insurance Company than has heretofore characterized the organization of universities and colleges."[3] Because of the market place design of the buildings at the University of Chicago and the perpetual packaging and repackaging of university offerings, the university became jokingly called "Harper's Bazaar."[1] Thorstein Veblen's scathing attack upon "captains of erudition," who conducted universities as if they were "captains of industry," was based largely upon his first-hand observations of Harper's presidency at Chicago.[2] The similarities between Harper's ideas of his day are easy to find, but it is not enough to say that Harper was merely parroting the views of the business elite. His goals were more social than economic; his desire for order and control stemmed more from his fear of anarchy than the promise of profit and production. But of course the cluster of ideas supporting economic concentration, social efficiency, and the leadership of the elite was the possession of no one man nor any single group. Indeed, they were characteristics of the era. But rather than assuming that Harper's educational and social ideas were simply an accommodation to industrial goals, one might wonder if Harper did not see industrial management as a means to develop the orderly educational system and social structure which he saw as requirements for a harmonious society.

---

[1] Harper, The Trend in Higher Education, pp. 35-54.

[2] Ibid., p. 54.

[3] Cited in Gould, The Chautauqua Movement, p. 63.

Veblen accused Harper of operating a university like a business, but Harper, to the contrary, viewed business operations analogous to the school:

> Every honest business transaction has in it the essential elements of educational training. Every business enterprise is a school in which the manager is principal, the heads of departments are teachers, the staff of employees the pupils. Nay more--it is a great laboratory. . . .[3]

---

[1] Storr, Harper's University, p. 164.

[2] Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918).

[3] Harper, The Trend in Higher Education, p. 41.

Thus business might be education, but education, to Harper, was not necessarily business. "Education is the basis," stated Harper, "of all democratic progress. The problems of education are, therefore, the problems of democracy. These are varied and complex; only the expert can appreciate their gravity."[1]

Thus education was not simply training a person for a business or a livlihood; more generally it was training for a position in society. The university man is thus the naturally equipped and scientifically trained expert who can offer higher abilities to social progress. Like many other educators of his day, Harper looked forward to the day when science could assess the inner qualities of men which would allow efficient selection of those suitable for the higher learning from those who were not. In fact, Harper thought that the scientific study of the student would be the next giant step, following the elective system, in the progress of higher education:

> But, now, in order that the freedom may not be abused, and in order that the student may receive the assistance so essential to his highest success, another step in the onward evolution will take place. The step will be the scientific study of the student himself.[2]

Harper predicted that colleges would eventually give each student a general diagnosis of traits, just as they might give physical exams to discover physical weaknesses, to determine: (1) character, to find out if the student is responsible, or careless, or shiftless, or perhaps vicious; (2) intellectual capacity, whether bright, dull, industrious or lazy; (3) special intellectual characteristics, an independent or routine mind; (4) special capacities and tastes, bookish, mechanical, scientific, literary, etc.; and (5) special nature, a leader or follower, good or bad use of leisure, etc. Such a thorough diagnosis would dictate, thought Harper, the student's course of study, instructors, and career.[1] Anticipating the role that guidance would later play in the community-junior college ideology, Harper realized the importance of "individualizing" the scientific procedure of categorizing people:

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 32. [2] _Ibid._, p. 321.

> Every student should be treated as if he were the only student in the institution; as if the institution had been created to meet his case. The cost of such a policy, it may be suggested, would be very great. True, but the waste avoided would more than counterbalance the cost.[2]

In many ways, Harper appears a man with ideas ahead of his times. Contemporary advocates of junior colleges, guidance programs, upper division colleges, and cluster colleges, can all find historical support for their causes in Harper's arguments. But by concentrating on Harper's pedagogical innovations one should not overlook the basic social and economic conservatism underlying them. Harper's goal of promoting an orderly, efficient society, in which men were trained ethically and technically for service in an industrial society, was not one which set him apart from the most conservative forces of the Age of Big Business.

David Starr Jordan

David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University from 1891 to 1913, achieved a national fame no less than that of William Rainey Harper, although it rested more on his activities in the peace movement than on his educational ideas. Jordan shared the general social outlook and educational designs of Harper, but the two men thought along parallel lines rather than along the same one. Jordan buttressed most of his conclusions with appeals to biological sciences whereas Harper chose to gather support mostly from the lessons of business organization. Both men advocated moral and ethical training, but Harper quoted the scriptures while Jordan stressed naturalism. Both feared the threat of the masses to an orderly society and urged public education as a control, but to Harper the real problem in the masses was a spiritual one while to Jordan it was an inherent element in the process of social evolution. Yet despite the many differences in the thinking of Harper and Jordan, both incorporated into their thoughts the core concepts of efficiency, evolution, and elitism which determined their views of society and education.

---

[1] See Chapter XX, "The Scientific Study of the Student," in Harper, The Trend in Higher Education, pp. 317-326.

[2] Harper, The Trend in Higher Education, p. 94.

Jordan was very much preoccupied with human evolution, not surprisingly considering his background in botany and biology. He wondered less at the accomplishments of man's present state of evolution, however, than over man's future destiny, which he maintained would be a future mankind of efficient ways and higher morality. He believed that only a few superior individuals in his society represented the "fittest" who would advance the whole race toward the "ideal manhood to which our human race must come."[1] The masses, in Jordan's view represented the bottom of the evolutionary ladder and should not be allowed to hold back the talented:

> To live aright, is to guide our lives in the direction in which humanity is going--not all humanity, not average humanity, but that saving remnant from whose loins shall spring the better man of the future.[2]

Jordan spoke often of the "democracy of the intellect" which he emphasized was little concerned with equality, except that all should have a fair chance to be educated to the limits of their abilities. And the limits upon the majority of people, according to Jordan's assessment of their inherited capacity, or lack of capacity, for achievement, were considerable.[1] In his autobiography, Jordan tells of his righteous indignation with some Englishmen who were boasting about the high intellectual quality of many of Great Britain's coal miners, thinking it complimentary to their country. Jordan entered the conversation to correct the Englishmen's misconception, reminding them that a good system of public schools would have trained these intelligent commoners to do higher things, profiting the community at large and uplifting the potential of the race.[2] The failure to lift an intelligent man from the masses was to Jordan a case of human waste and inefficiency that was a sin against society.

---

[1] Jordan, Care and Culture, p. 226. [2] Ibid., p. 224.

Just as it was inefficient in Jordan's view to give the intelligent too little training, trying to extend education beyond an individual's mental limitations was also wasteful. Jordan counseled youth that a college education would do many things "if you are made of the right stuff; for you cannot fasten a two-thousand dollar education to a fifty cent boy."[3] Allowing the "multitude" into the university, Jordan warned, would "cheapen" and "vulgarize" higher education.[4] Jordan's elitist view of human nature was tempered by his efforts to reconcile them with democracy. Like Harper, he thought the number of people who had risen to the full measure of their capabilities to be far below what it should be, and he justified increased education for all, with the exception of the wasteful effort just mentioned, in order both to improve the majority of people and to detect those with exceptional talent:

---

[1] Jordan, "University Tendencies in America," pp. 141-143.

[2] Jordan, The Days of a Man, II, 477.

[3] Jordan, Care and Culture, p. 1.

[4] Ibid., p. 117.

> Every man that lives has a right to some form of higher education. For there is no man that would not be made better and stronger by continuous training . . . To furnish the higher education that humanity needs, the college must be broad as humanity. No spark of talent man may possess should be outside its fostering care. To fit man into schemes of education has been the mistake of the past. To fit education to man is the work of the future.[1]

Thus Jordan was convinced that human nature determined a stratified society based on abilities, and the growth of an industrial society which offered many channels for various strata he viewed as an economic development conducive to human evolutionary growth.

A recurring theme in Jordan's writings is the need to break up the masses, allowing talented individuals to rise to positions in accord with their abilities. Nowhere is he clear, however, on the structure of society between the lowly multitude and the intellectual elite. Most of his comments are addressed to the evils of the masses or the virtues of the elite. The elite, usually identified by Jordan as "university men," not only determine the future evolution of mankind but also use their intelligence to keep the masses in check. Jordan advised university men that more would be expected of them in the way of citizenship: that in particular they must be able to resist leveling and unthinking stands of the masses; that they have the responsibility for "right-thinking." But university men were not just to resist the leveling influence of the masses; they were to involve themselves in promoting the correct thinking of the masses:

> The great danger in democracy is the seeming predominance of the weak. The strong and true seem to be never in the majority . . . 'A flaw in thought an inch long,' says a Chinese poet, 'leaves a trace of a thousand miles.' If collective action is to be safe, the best thought of the best men must control it.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 73-74.

Noting that monarchies need men of high culture and exact training to hold office, Jordan suggested that democracies have an even greater need for such men to "hold the people. They must form fixed points in the civic mass, units of intelligence, not to be bribed nor stampeded."[1]

Jordan's passion for efficiency, systemization, and order was no less arduous than was Harper's, but it was more consistently cast in supposedly "scientific" terms. Organization, Jordan believed, was the root of science: "Science," he stated, "is ordered knowledge, no more, no less."[2] The strength of science, Jordan argued, was more in organization than in knowledge. In fact, The Higher Foolishness which he published eleven years after he retired, dealt with the strong influence of organized, systematized ignorance. He gave the title "Sciosophy" to the organization of erroneous fact gathered from philosophy, religion, politics, and astrology, connected by a bond of emotion and intuition. Sciosophy, he claimed, exercised an unfortunate and powerful influence on men which knowledge alone was finding difficult to overcome.[3] Both Jordan and Harper had faith in the fact that the most organized way, the most efficient way, the most scientific way, and the most moral way, were all the same way. And they applied this belief to educational systems in remarkably similar ways.

Before looking specifically into Jordan's educational ideology, we can gain a valuable perspective by viewing more closely the importance that race and eugenics played in his thinking. Inherited traits, according to Jordan, not only determined the future of individuals but also of nations, or as he put it:

---

[1] David Starr Jordan, The Voice of the Scholar (San Francisco: Paul Elder & Co., 1903), p. 13.

[2] Jordan, The Higher Foolishness, p. 200. [3] Ibid., p. 14.

> The blood of a nation determines its history. The history of a nation determines its blood.[1]

There was no doubt in Jordan's mind which blood was superior; it was that of the "Anglo-Saxon" race, and he had little sympathy for these people called the "victims of oppression":

> In these times it is well for us to remember that we come of hardy stock. The Anglo-Saxon race, with its strength and virtues, was born of hard times. It is not easily kept down; the victims of oppression must be of some other stock . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> The problem of life is not to make life easier, but to make men stronger, so that no problem shall be beyond their solution. . . . There is no growth without its struggle.[2]

The need to preserve the best specimens of the race led Jordan to be a life-long pacifist, altering his principles only long enough to support the nation after its entry, which he opposed, into World War One. "By a law of biology," stated Jordan,

> the man who is left determines the future of the race for "like begets like" and each generation repeats the qualities of its actual ancestry. Long-continued extirpation of courage leaves a spineless residue. . . .[3]

Jordan worked and wrote tirelessly against war, consistently opposing it in the interests of racial progress.[4] The day after Dewey's 1898 victory over the Spanish in Manilla Bay found Jordan lecturing an audience in San Francisco against the folly of acquiring the Philippines with a racial stock inappropriate for American democracy.[1] Active in the national and international peace movement from that time forward, Jordan gained a widespread reputation for his views on war and race. He counseled with Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Elihu Root, and William Jennings Bryan on matters of peace, and he was, from the beginning in 1910, a trustee for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.[2] The same basic racial assumptions that made Jordan a widely-known war critic also contributed heavily to his educational ideology, based on a premium education for the top of the racial stock.

---

[1] Jordan, The Blood of the Nation: A Study of the Decay of the Races Through the Survival of the Unfit (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1910), p. 7.

[2] Jordan, Care and Culture, pp. 58-59.

[3] Jordan, The Days of a Man, II, 396.

[4] See Jordan's The Blood of the Nation; for a longer version of the same topic see The Human Harvest: A Study of the Decay of Races Through the Survival of the Unfit (Boston: Beacon Press, 1907). Other books by Jordan on the subject are: War and Waste (1913); War and the Breed (1915); Ways to Lasting Peace (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1916); World Peace and the College Man (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1916); Democracy and World Relations (New York: World Book Co., 1918). Jordan also wrote numerous anti-war magazine and journal articles.

Jordan's conception of the ideal educational system originated, as did Harper's, with the idea of the elite university as the crowning feature of the total educational structure. Also like Harper, and most other aspiring presidents of universities, Jordan often drew upon the German model of an educational system as one for the United States to study. But Jordan did not assign such importance to a sharp line of division between general and specialized learning as did Harper, and he did not set out university re-organization as one of his prominent life goals. Perhaps this was because Jordan was investing his energies more into efforts of a wider social and political scope, specifically the peace movement.

Early in his career as a university president, still at Indiana University, Jordan looked forward to the day when no educational structures at all would exist between the high school, where all work would be prescribed, and the university, where all work would be elective.[1] He later came to believe that the collegiate function within universities could not be abandoned, less for the practical reasons that confronted Harper than because he realized that the dividing line between specialized and general work varied so much among individuals that the university had to attend to both.[2] But he continued to agree with Harper's analysis of the inevitable fate of small colleges unable to evolve into true universities:

---

[1] Jordan, The Days of a Man, I, 616.

[2] Jordan, The Days of a Man, II, pp. 290-342.

> The small college may become either a junior college or high-grade preparatory school, sending its men elsewhere for the flower of their college education, or else it must become a small university running narrowly on a few lines, but attending to these with devotion and persistence.[3]

Jordan sought to maintain the collegiate function within the university partly to allow advanced undergraduates to take specialized courses, and in turn, to provide general learning where needed by graduate students, and partly to hold on to the collegiate ideal of molding good character. He rejected the arguments of those wishing to adopt the German system *in toto* because he thought it would be tragic for American democracy to end cultural training with the high school. In Germany such training did end with the gymnasium. Jordan felt that higher education in Germany, which emphasized training in scholarship and ignored training in personal habits, resulted in waste of life and character that was "simply horrifying." Professors, maintained Jordan, must exert a moral influence on their students:

---

[1] Jordan, *Care and Culture*, p. 54.

[2] David Starr Jordan, "The Actual and the Proper Lines of Distinction Between College and University Work," Association of American Universities *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, V (1904) 25-33.

[3] Jordan, "University Tendencies in America," p. 146.

> . . . The should stand strongly against the student vices, against cheating, gambling, dishonest behavior, yellow journalism, and all forms of alcoholic conviviality . . . From the "beer-bust" of the College to the red-light district of the town, the way is short and straight, and thousands of young men find themselves ruined from a single night of excesses.[1]

Jordan's belief that personal character was largely inherited led him to conclude that problems in the moral training of students stemmed partly from the presence of students without inner moral potential. "If we insist that our colleges shall not pretend to educate those who cannot or will not be educated," argued Jordan, "we shall have no trouble with the moral training of the students." Condemning both the "aristocratic ills of idleness" and the "democratic vice of rowdyism," Jordan asserted that daily vigilance and devotion to weeding out "mock students" was a necessary function of "real teachers."[2] Jordan himself, as previously mentioned, was not lax in punishing student vice, suspending 132 students at a single time for drinking escapades. All the same, he recognized that the most efficient and effective controls over human vice were internal restraints rather than external regulations, and in the 1920's he reminded colleges that jazz and bootlegging posed less of a threat to students than the absence of "righteous models" for character development.[3]

The element of traditional collegiate concern for character development in Jordan's thought, however, modified only slightly his stronger commitment to building a university focused on academic specialization and research. His defense of merging college and university functions was not a defense of the traditional four-year curriculum nor even a defense of four college years. Not only did Jordan second Harper's suggestion that weak colleges convert to junior colleges, but he also moved to free Stanford from the lower task of providing freshman and sophomore classes. During the aftermath of the 1906 San Francisco earthquake, Jordan proposed to the Stanford faculty that their rebuilding plans aim the development of the university toward professional training and research. He suggested that after 1910 the university should require two years of collegiate work in addition to its requirement of high school graduation. After studying the proposal, the faculty recommended that the suggestion should be adopted, but not until further development of junior colleges in the state would make it practical.[1] The proposal never re-emerged, largely because of the need for students or at least their fees,[2] but Jordan, even after his retirement, continued to reiterate his belief that the four traditional years of college "breaks in the wrong place, too early for 'completing an education' and too late for approaching professional life,"[3] and that the junior college offered a more acceptable division.

---

[1] David Starr Jordan, "The Care and Culture of Freshmen," North American Review, CXCI (April, 1910), 443.

[2] Jordan, "University Tendencies in America," p. 146.

[3] David Starr Jordan, "The University and Moral Teaching," School and Society, XX (December 20, 1924), 793-794.

Since Jordan did not actually institute a junior college at Stanford, as Harper did at Chicago, and since he has not been claimed as inspirational founder of any particular California junior college, he demonstrates more clearly than Harper that the junior college was not so much a definite institution in his thinking as it was a place, or many places, where the university could relegate its lower functions. But Jordan and Harper were both very much in accord with this conception, and although they saw junior college work in the domain of secondary education, or at least below university education, it concerned them little in principle whether that work was performed by high schools, public or private colleges, or in junior college departments within universities. Their real concern was that the university structure reflect that institution's preeminence in the evolving educational system, and that university students correspondingly represent respective positions on the human evolutionary scale.

---

[1] Jordan, The Days of a Man, II, 171-172.

[2] Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, p. 259.

[3] David Starr Jordan, "The Junior College," The Forum, LXXV (March, 1926), 450.

Like Harper, Jordan looked upon a large business consolidation as the university's counterpart at the top of the evolutionary ladder in the business world. Its efficient organization not only permitted increased specialization in jobs but also, according to Jordan, promoted a higher morality in business:

> (Business today and in the future) demands a higher grade of intelligence and a more highly specialized ability than the individual commerce of a generation ago. It therefore demands higher training. It demands also a higher morality. No great business can rest permanently on a cutthroat basis. In spite of contrary appearances, business morality is on a higher plane in these days of vast combinations than it was when each merchant hunted, spider fashion, for his prey, and clerks were paid to make black seem white and to lead the unwilling customer to buy what he did not want.[1]

The congruence between Jordan's educational philosophy and the business philosophy of entrepreneurs, such as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and of course Stanford, both based on a Spencerian view of man and society, stimulated the philanthropy of the businessmen and encouraged the presence of educators on the boards of philanthropic foundations. Jordan served as an original trustee on the board of the Carnegie Foundation for the Improvement of

---

[1] Jordan, The Voice of the Scholar, pp. 142-143.

Teaching,[1] and he served in that position to 1916 when at age 65 he himself became a Carnegie pensioner.[2]

Harper and Jordan's conviction that large-scale, co-operative organization was the evolutionary key to the future led them to combine efforts, along with other university presidents, in establishing the Association of American Universities, an outgrowth of the 1900 Chicago meeting previously noted. Along with Dr. Conaty of the Catholic University, Harper and Jordan prepared the original constitution of that organization. Efficient organization required structure in higher education.[3] And their efforts for structure were never simply to allow better institutional functioning in a technical sense; always they were certain that higher social and moral outcomes would result. Their efforts were not simply those of mechanics but actually those of healers--they were administering, or so they believed, to the ills of society rather than merely solving the problems of their own institutions.

Alexis F. Lange

Alexis F. Lange shared Harper and Jordan's preoccupation with organization and efficiency, and, like them, he viewed the university as the pinnacle of educational evolution. But Lange's singular focus on the junior college as a separate entity, itself evolving toward an ideal form, led him to go far beyond Harper and Jordan in actually specifying the characteristics of the ideal junior college. The particular public, comprehensive junior college that Lange envisioned appears on the surface far removed from the multi-institutional, university-oriented junior college concept of Harper and Jordan, yet both rested firmly on the same ideological basis--the need to promote order and efficiency, both in the institutions of society and the internal moral fiber of men.

---

[1] Harper was also appointed to serve on this board, but his failing health prevented him from attending any meetings.

[2] Jordan, The Days of a Man, II, 187-191.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

Lange's involvement in university re-organization at the University of California closely paralleled the activities of Harper and Jordan, although, as a faculty member instead of a president, Lange did not acquire visible leadership in re-structuring the university. Lange had attended the University of Michigan in the 1880's and was there exposed to the idea (lingering on from Henry Tappan's impact as its first president and the unsuccessful attempts of its president then, James B. Angell, to rid the university of the freshmen and sophomore years) that a student should have completed both adolescence and his general learning before undertaking university work. At Michigan, Lange took advantage of the new "university system" which equated upper division work--the junior and senior years--with graduate study, and which permitted Lange to receive upon examination both a bachelor and a master's degree three years after entering the institution.[1] In 1890, two years before receiving his Ph.D. from Michigan, Lange began his thirty-four year career at the University of California at Berkeley, which developed from a position teaching English to Director of the School of Education. He served on a university committee which recommended a reorganization scheme, adopted in 1902, that divided lower and upper division work; a certificate was granted students who completed the lower division, and the certificate was required for entrance into the upper division.[2] These ideas and actions were in perfect accord with those of Harper and Jordan.

---

[1] Gallagher, "From Tappan to Lange," pp. 25-28. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

Furthermore, Lange's idealization of the junior college did not diminish the belief in the superiority of the university that he shared with Harper and Jordan. Nothing ranked higher in Lange's repertoire of superlatives than "efficient," and thus he paid universities the supreme compliment when he stated that they were "more efficient than any other social institutions of the land."[1] Lange saw universities at the top level of the society's institutional and moral structure, an exemplar of American democracy:

> Ideally, American academic citizenship conforms to the highest type of American citizenship in general. Ideally, the spirit of the university, university spirit, public spirit, patriotism, the spirit of socal (sic) service, are only different aspects of the same thing.[2]

Lange also supported Jordan's concern that the superiority of the university was not always matched by the nature of its students, but he avoided labeling the mismatches as inferior. Once suggesting that 25 percent of university students would be better off in a vocational school, had one been available for them, Lange added that the university would contribute to more efficient social service if it relieved itself "of students intended for life-work just as noble but different from that for which a university prepares."[3] Thus Lange was clearly in the same ideological camp as Harper and Jordan in joining their campaign to purify and elevate university education by eliminating lower levels of instruction and removing unfit students. Lange did not leave this camp when he redefined the nature of the junior college; he merely gave the ideology new forms.

---

[1] Lange, University Efficiency, p. 14.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

[3] Ibid., p. 8.

Lange's emphasis upon the junior college as a method of achieving efficient educational organization and efficient people was central to all his writings:

> The rise and progress of the Junior College needs to be looked upon as an integral phase of a country-wide movement toward a more adequate state system of education; a twentieth century system, made in America; a system that shall function progressively so as to secure for the nation the greatest efficiency of the greatest number.[1]

A major factor distinguishing Lange from Harper and Jordan was his closer attention to the full potential of the junior college as the capstone of secondary education, rather than considering only the single function of preparing university students. In this regard he came to appreciate the contribution that the junior college could make in the name of general social efficiency by educating an entire class of people below university stature.

While Lange made many references to the German system of education, as did Harper and Jordan, he was the first to emphasize that the United States had internal reasons for adopting the junior college idea other than those behind the German gymnasium. For one, he stressed the American commitment to individual development, and he drew upon the young field of psychology to support an educational design appropriate to the entire period of adolescence. For another, a tact which would grow in the community-junior college ideology, Lange offered the need "to increase the economic efficiency of the nation through the creation of lower and middle systems of vocational training." These native concerns of America, argued Lange, meant that the junior college should be four things: (1) an integral part of secondary education; (2) organized around two departments--one to promote general social efficiency and one to promote vocational efficiency at levels directly below the professions; (3) concerned primarily with those students planning to go no further in institutional schooling; and (4) as a lesser matter, one path for university-bound students to follow.[1] As professor of education, Lange was familiar with Dewey's writings and assigned them in class. But there was really nothing new in the search for community and order, through the application of intelligent organization, pursued by Dewey, Lange, and countless others. It was largely the same search being made by Harper and Jordan, although Dewey and Lange showed a greater willingness to pursue the goal as a public venture, and they used more democratic rhetoric. Lange's suggestion of a Department of Civic Education as the core of every junior college is evidence of the compatability of conservative and progressive interests. Simply stated, this department would help citizens "do better things in better ways," one way of defining social efficiency. It would promote a feeling for group life and citizenship responsibilities. It would reduce social conflict, promote harmony and hard-working people, and train people for social service. The latter function of the department, mentioned by Lange as "the introduction of training opportunities for specific social efficiency," could help eliminate corruption in government service by training public servants in a field of expertise through an apprentice program in the junior college. The department could further advance the cause of social efficiency, maintained Lange, by assisting teachers on lower levels to prepare materials for the training of citizenship, and by developing a school-community life that would be preparatory for life in the adult community.[1]

---

[1] Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College With Special Reference to California," Educational Administration, II (January, 1916), 1.

---

[1] Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College," Sierra Educational News, XVI (October, 1920), 277-278.

The vocational aspect of Lange's case for the junior college was not simply a call for technical training nor merely a reflection of national economic needs. Instead, he came close to making the same case that he made for the Department of Civic Education, that the training received would make better citizens and community-minded workers. Lange was not concentrating on people for particular jobs but rather on a class of persons above the common man but below the university man. He referred to the structure as analogous to the military:

> The prospect is that before long intelligently organized and administered continuation and trade school arrangements will exist that will assist the great mass of those with an elementary education in becoming efficient workers, as much for the sake of a better human and civic life as for a better living. But how about the occupations that require a higher foundation of general education, that presuppose greater maturity for grasp and mastery, that represent the positions of commissioned officers in the national peace army?[2]

The idea of continuation schools and trade schools interested Lange. On a trip to Germany he examined some continuation schools for the lower class workers and returned to the United States with ideas to teach similar low level skills in the American educational system. He wrote a manuscript, never published, in which he advocated the continuation school concept for the "greatest efficiency of the greatest number."[3] But Lange also had difficulty with the German continuation school model, for it was part of a social system much too rigid for a democracy. He finally concluded that the different level functions, necessary for an efficient society, had to have some common educational experience binding them into an organic whole. He came to oppose any separate vocational education system:

---

[1] Lange, "A Junior College Department of Civic Education," pp. 442-448.

[2] Alexis F. Lange, "What Manner of Child," p. 214.

[3] Lengthy quotations from the unpublished manuscript appear in Gallagher, "From Tappan to Lange," pp. 175-181. This one is on p. 177.

> What Germany has done in her paternalistic way we must do in our democratic way. How? By diversifying education and at the same time keeping its technical offshoots in vital connection with the one non-technical stem. There is every reason, pedagogical and social, why vocational schools should not be allowed to constitute a system by themselves.[1]

In true Progressive fashion, Lange talked more of the social skills and attitudes involved in vocational education than he did specific mechanical skills. Its goal was social harmony more than economic progress. Lange lectured secondary school teachers that their final objective, whether they be taught in junior high schools, high schools, or junior colleges, must be:

> . . . the most abundant and dynamic single and group life that can be achieved by and for Americans, and that all other objectives are never terminals but more or less indispensible way stations, such as physical fitness, the right uses of leisure, mastery of a vocation, efficient citizenship, the conquest by youth of the best that has been said and thought and so on.[2]

While Harper and Jordan were not particularly concerned if the junior college was within the university, a converted private liberal-arts college, or an extended high school, Lange wanted a definite answer to the question which he posed this way:

> Shall certain colleges have their heads cut off, and, if so, by whom? . . . Shall the American university-college have its legs cut off, and, if so, where? . . . Shall the American four-year high schools be stretched, and, if so, how?[3]

---

[1] Lange, The Lange Book, p. 25.

[2] Alexis F. Lange, "Training Secondary School Teachers," p. 507.

[3] Lange, The Lange Book, p. 103.

Actually, the question was a rhetorical one, for Lange had his answer very definitely in mind: an extended high school, separately organized but retaining an organic tie, of two more years. He feared that both a small private junior college and one within a university system would be "merely a university entrance hall or vestibule" rather than having a proper place as "the dome of the secondary school edifice." Lange even felt uncomfortable with the term "college" in "junior college," calling it "scholastic camouflage."[1] Despite the high regard that Lange held for the university as the pinnacle to all education, he felt that its needs would devour the separate good that the junior college could do, a situation he compared to that of a missionary and a cannibal.[2]

Not only did Lange insist that the junior college properly belonged as part of public secondary education, he further maintained that it be distinct from, although not necessarily separate from, the high school. Lange always coupled his argument for this distinction with a similar plea regarding the junior high school, which he usually called an "intermediate school." W. W. Kemp has written that Lange must share credit for stimulating junior college development with Jordan, but that he is the "unquestionable father" of the junior high school movement.[3] Again, this differed from Jordan and Harper's repeated advice that the high school extend itself in both directions only in that Lange advocated a definite tripartite structure to facilitate smooth transitions within the general framework of secondary education. The new wine of social efficiency, Lange suggested in an uncharacteristic metaphor to the Manual Arts section of the California Teachers' Association in 1917, should be served in the new bottles of the intermediate school and the junior college.[1]

---

[1] Lange, "What Manner of Child," p. 211.

[2] Ibid., p. 215.

[3] Kemp, "Alexis F. Lange," The Dictionary of American Biography, p. 591.

Lange's major commitment to the development of secondary education as opposed to university education accounts for a large part of the new applications of evolution, elitism, and efficiency that he envisioned which set him apart from Harper and Jordan. But it is also important that Lange, as a scholar primarily concerned with the social impact of education in the first two decades of the twentieth century, was more directly in touch with the mainstream of ideas generated by the Progressive movement, particularly the writings of John Dewey, Edward L. Thorndike, G. Stanley Hall, and Lester Frank Ward.[2] This influence of the strongest intellectual currents of Progressivism did not drastically alter the basic ideas of evolution, elitism, and efficiency which Lange held in common with Harper and Jordan. In fact, these concepts were very much present in the writings of Progressive intellectuals. The influence of Progressivism on Lange was to clothe his writings in a stronger, more democratic rhetoric and to allow him to view the evolutionary process as a faster moving, more man-directed process.

Lange's intellectual debt to Dewey is clear in his reaction to military preparedness and World War One. Lange attempted to save the term "preparedness" from a strictly military connotation, insisting that the really essential and necessary form of national preparedness was the building of efficient people. Lange once described preparedness in the following Deweyian problem-solving terms:

---

[1] Lange, "New Wine in New Bottles," p. 12.

[2] Gallagher, "From Tappan to Lange," pp. 29-31ff.

> It is not the amount of so-called knowledge, not the degree of specialized skill, but the power of dealing intelligently with new problems and situations, which power, to be sure, can not be developed without knowledge and constant purposeful practice.[1]

In connection with preparedness, Lange spoke often of "thoroughbredness," a term for well-developed efficiency, as a key factor; he did not emphasize the inherited biological aspects of this personal quality, as Jordan did, but rather concentrated on its development through proper citizenship training. Lange made the following distinction between "native" Americans and "thoroughbred" Americans:

> To be born and reared in America is by no means the same as to be American born and bred. In the latter case citizenship and personality are one and inseparable; in the former, citizenship may be like an unimproved city lot held by an alien for the unearned increment. But in order to succeed with the process of national preparedness we must produce not native aliens, but thoroughbred Americans, whose citizenship is as vital a part of them as their brains and hearts.[2]

An aspect of Lange's thought that deserved special mention is his conception of the junior college as a community-centered institution. To Harper and Jordan, the junior college was a part of a self-contained educational structure whose impact on the community would essentially be only from the production of, more specifically its part in the production of, citizens and workers. To Lange, again influenced by the writings of John Dewey, the school needed to be of the community, not isolated from it, and the use of the community as a learning laboratory as well as a recipient of service from the school was considered important. Part of Lange's arguments in favor of a Department of Civic Education was to make the junior college "as widely and directly useful to the community as possible." Making surveys, developing social centers and helping with settlement house work, offering extension classes, interning students in positions of city service, and preparing adult immigrants for citizenship were all mentioned as possible junior college projects of community involvement by Lange.[1] There was nothing new in the idea of a school being a vital community element. Charles Van Hise became famous for involving the University of Wisconsin in wide-ranging economic and social programs in that state. The promoters of the high school at the turn of the century were probably the most energetic in support of the idea that the school could reflect, plan, heal, and in most ways uplift the local community; they commonly referred to high schools as "people's colleges." As a self-confessed secondary school man, Lange no doubt acquired many of his particular ideas of the school as an active agent in the community from high school advocates. In a 1917 address to the Junior College Section of the California Teachers' Association Lange stated:

---

[1] Alexis F. Lange, "Preparedness," School and Society, V (January 6, 1917), 4.

[2] Alexis F. Lange, "Our Preparedness Program," School and Society, VI (September 29, 1917), 362.

> It has always required faith, the substance of things hoped for but not seen, to regard the high school as the people's college. With the inclusion of the junior college the name stands for a fact.[2]

Lange consciously played the role of a prophet in 1916 by describing 1950 high schools; his futuristic description from an imaginary Cyclopedia of Education consisted of four basic points: (1) The high school was no longer something to squeeze between other parts of the school system, but rather was geared to cover systematically the whole period of early, middle and late adolescence; (2) Vocational education existed at all levels, giving all an economic sense and providing unity as opposed to the class system in Europe; (3) The content and method was geared for the socialization of the individual, emphasizing social service for those with aptitudes for it; and (4) The influence of the high school had spread far and wide, doing extension work and acting as the state's chief organ for producing intelligent, high-principled, public-spirited citizens.[1] As the capstone of the high school system, Lange saw the junior college of the future as the finishing school for civic virtue.

---

[1] Lange, "A Junior College Department of Civic Education," p. 447.

[2] Lange, "What Manner of Child," p. 213.

Efficiency and the Junior College

The underlying ideological theme that united the different concepts of the junior college held by Harper, Jordan, and Lange was the promotion of efficiency, both individual and social. The key role of efficiency, with its multiple individual, social, industrial, and moral meanings, was indeed a fundamental conceptual ideal in the Progressive era.[2] Harper,

---

[1] Alexis F. Lange, "The New High School and the New High School Teacher," School and Society, IV (August 19, 1916), 267-269.

[2] Samuel P. Hays, Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890-1920 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), was one of the first American historians to develop fully the conceptual base of efficiency in Progressivism. In education, Callahan's Education and the Cult of Efficiency (1962) is a perceptive study of the relationship of education and efficiency, but it lacks sound perspectives. Chapter XI, "Social Efficiency Triumphant," in Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, is an excellent source. The relationship between an early leader in vocational education and social efficiency has been explored in Walter H. Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967). In higher education, historians have generally missed the significance of the underlying theme of efficiency, although they have detected its presence. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University, for instance, reported that efficiency was more of a slogan than an ideal since he could find no common theme or conception of the term in the rhetoric. (p. 117) This also led Veysey to state that Harper was a man with charisma and without an ideology, an administrator untouched by the power of abstract ideas (p. 368). Had Veysey been looking not for a common definition but a set of unifying ideals, he might have seen that efficiency itself was Harper's ideology.

Jordan, and Lange were certainly not unique or original in their designs to restructure the educational system to promote efficiency. Committees of the National Education Association, beginning with the famous Committee of Ten, periodically reported in favor or reorganization for the sake of efficiency.[1] The great hopes for educational and social efficiency were not limited to only the United States either; Matthew Arnold, for example, carried on a similar campaign in England in an attempt to preserve order from the threat of anarchy.[2] It is difficult for us today to appreciate the multi-dimensional meanings attached to "efficiency" at the turn of the century, and it appears to us naive to think that a commitment to efficiency would result in personal and social utopia. Nevertheless, Harper, Jordan, and Lange continually wrote of efficiency with all of the conviction, faith and hope of men pursuing a religious ideal.

Since the idea of efficiency itself had multiple levels and dimensions, a change in the general use of the term is not easy to detect. Overall, however, Harper, Jordan, and Lange did shift their emphasis between 1890 to 1920 from efficiency as specialization to efficiency as a matter of general culture. This shift is noticeable in their approach to the junior college, especially in the cases of Harper and Jordan, which in the early years emphasized the junior college as a preliminary step toward greater specialization and in later years stressed the value of more general, cultural education for all.[1]

---

[1] See Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1957), pp. 71-118ff; Sizer, Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century, passim. The role of the NEA and other agencies desirous of promoting greater order and efficiency in higher education is detailed in R. L. Duffus, Democracy Enters the College: A Study of the Rise and Decline of the Academic Lockstep (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936).

[2] S. J. Curtis and M. E. A. Boultwood, A Short History of Educational Ideas (London: University Tutorial Press Ltd., 1964), pp. 449-461.

The basic goal of orderly men and an orderly society did not change, however. The concept of culture itself, in the early part of the twentieth century, meant right-doing more than social understanding; it was to assist, or replace, religion as the guide to proper thought and behavior.[2] The relationship between the junior college as an efficient administrative unit in secondary education and as a distributor of general culture is ideologically close, for both concepts stemmed from a fundamental desire for harmony and order. In a society racked by unparalleled conflicts between cultural groups and social classes, this desire was a natural one.

Despite the democratic rhetoric of Harper, Jordan, and Lange, urging efficiency and cultural training for all, their social outlook remained to the end elitist. Their plans for the American educational system were essentially to transform it, as Perkinson noted others were doing, from the "great equalizer" to the "great selector" of society.[3] Since they assumed that the criteria for selection was scientific, whether biological or sociological, this was enough to allow them to overlook any discrepancy between democratic ideals and elitist programs. But their supposed scientific criteria were actually little more than a reformulation of white, anglo-saxon, protestant morality in the fashionable terminology of social Darwinism and scientific management.

---

[1] A shift among major figures in American higher education from an emphasis on specialization to an emphasis on liberal culture was pinpointed by Veysey as the years 1908-1909, *The Emergence of the American University*, pp. 255-256. Russell Thomas also noted a revival in general or cultural education shortly after the turn of the century: Russell Thomas, *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962), pp. 52-54.

[2] Oscar Handlin, *John Dewey's Challenge to Education* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), p. 33; also see Oscar and Mary F. Handlin, *The American College and American Culture* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970), p. 50. Henry F. May, in *The End of American Innocence* (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1959), p. 30, noted that "culture" in the early 20th century meant "not so much a way of describing how people behaved as an idea of how they ought to behave and did not."

[3] Henry J. Perkinson, *The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965* (New York: Random House, 1968), pp. 145-146.

Two of the major controversies swirling around educational circles at the turn of the century were over vocational education and the elective system.[1] Harper, Jordan, and Lange had clear ideas on both of these issues but generally did not put them forward as matters of central importance. All three thought that the elective system, necessary in an earlier era, needed to be modified with some regulation to insure efficient learning and orderly knowledge. Jordan, who criticized the B.S. degree as a "Bachelor of Surfaces,"[2] instituted a major-minor system at Indiana University in the 1880's.[3] Harper's plan for concentrated areas from which electives could be selected and Lange's all inclusive Department of Civic Education, both already discussed, place them in the camp of those desirous of modifying the freedom of the elective system with some core requirements in areas of basic knowledge. As to the basic areas of knowledge, Harper, Jordan, and Lange did not enter the fray.

In the area of vocational education, Harper, Jordan and Lange remained old fashioned, that is if Fisher's observation that trade-training had become the dominant thought on the subject among educators by 1910 is correct.[1] It has already been noted that Lange's idea of vocational education was basically citizenship training and definitely not merely inculcating technical skills. Jordan side-stepped the practical versus cultural argument by arguing that there really was no distinction between the two, and, if there were, cultural education would be the most practical in the long run. But he usually refused to make even a hypothetical distinction, maintaining that in true Deweyian fashion there was "no such thing as manual training as distinguished from training of the intellect."[2] When Jordan was selected by Leland Stanford in 1891 it was largely because he thought higher education should be more useful, but Jordan was thinking of useful knowledge, as he learned from White at Cornell, as scientific knowledge, not at all as trade-training. He kept this orientation his whole career. Harper's focus on the higher learning kept him from ever discussing the learning of lower economic skills, but it is clear in his writings that the education he envisioned for the masses was of the general "cultural" level endorsed by Jordan and Lange.

---

[1] For a thorough study of the thinking embracing vocational education see Berenice M. Fisher, Industrial Education: American Ideals and Institutions (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967). Studies abound on the elective system; it is a dramatic focus of R. Freeman Butts, The College Charts Its Course (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939).

[2] Jordan, "University Tendencies," p. 145.

[3] Jordan, The Days of a Man, I, 293.

To the extent that the origin of the community-junior college ideology was the product of the most published early advocates of the junior college--Harper, Jordan, and Lange--it was clearly the product of a search for efficiency. It cannot be assumed, however, that the extensive publications of these men insured a dominant influence on the thinking of others interested in junior colleges. For one thing, the university presses, or at least university publishing funds, afforded Harper and Jordan generous space in print, and Lange's close affiliation with the California Teachers'

---

[1] Fisher, Industrial Education, p. 85.

[2] Jordan, Care and Culture, pp. 168-169.

Association assured the publication of his articles in its journal, The Sierra Educational News. Yet without proof of cause and effect in the relationship of the most prolific early writers on the junior college to the ideology of other junior college leaders, it is enough to say that the need for efficiency articulated by the three educators was characteristic of their age and that their ideological support for the development of junior colleges reflected most clearly the craze for efficiency.

As a final comment on the development of community-junior college ideology from 1890 to 1920, it should be emphasized that the institution known as the junior college was just coming into being, and there remained in 1920 many questions about its identity. F. M. McDowell undertook a study for the Bureau of Education in 1919, stating the need for his investigation thusly:

> The junior college is in an experimental stage. We do not know what it should be, because we do not know what it is. Before we can see clearly what it is, we must know why it is.[1]

McDowell's study determined that in every state where the junior college movement had made significant progress, it did so in the wake of university influence. But he also noticed a lesser current of influence, that would grow in later years, coming from independent high school leaders, concerned more with local matters and vocational training. While McDowell reported that the number of private junior colleges were twice that of public ones, the thirty-nine public junior colleges had nearly as many students and were clearly the type of junior college "attracting most attention at present."[2]

---

[1] F. M. McDowell, The Junior College, U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 35 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1919), pp. 6-7

[2] Ibid., p. 46.

Thus by 1920, one is hard pressed to speak of a junior college movement, not to mention a junior college ideology. A set of ideas had been formulated, however, which promoted the idea of the junior college on the bases of efficient, cultured people and an efficient, industrial nation. Out of this set of ideas, the community-junior college ideology developed.

CHAPTER III

THE RISE OF "TERMINAL EDUCATION"

The period in the United States from 1920 to 1941 was no calmer than were the three previous decades. The brief economic depression at the end of World War One gave way quickly to a chaotic prosperity during the 1920's, only to end in the worst economic collapse in the nation's history. After a war to end all wars and make the world safe for democracy, Americans witnessed during the twenties and thirties the collapse of transplanted democracies and the rise of communist and fascist dictatorships throughout the world. A faith in progress through capitalism, nourished by tremendous business production in the twenties, was severely tested during the thirties, and the alternative of socialism appealed to ever greater numbers of Americans.

During this era, when great hopes were challenged by bitter realities, the ideological stance behind the community-junior college movement, as far as it is revealed in the writings of the major spokesmen for the movement, remained remarkably unchanged. The economic depression of the 1930's, which led many to question the capitalistic structure of American society, seemed only to convince national community-junior college leaders all the more that the educational design they proposed would help the nation maintain an orderly, efficient, industrial society. The community-junior college was advocated in particular during the depression to ease unemployment and reduce crime and more generally to advance what was called the "social intelligence" and the "economic efficiency" of the nation. There was never the slightest hint in the depression writings of the community-junior college leaders that any fault existed in the basic economic and social structures of the nation; their writings were instead directed, generally speaking, to the need to improve individual competencies and attitudes.

The topic which was the single most important focus of attention of the community-junior college leaders from 1920 to 1941 was "terminal education." Whereas Harper, Jordan, and Lange viewed the junior college in part as a convenient and efficient selection device for the university, their concern was primarily for students preparing for university work. The new generation of spokesmen for the junior college, however, addressed most of their writings to the needs, as they saw them, of the majority of junior college students who would go no further in their formal education. This "terminal" group of students, reportedly consisting of 60 to 75 percent of all junior college students, was seen in need of a special type of education, one that was different from the education of a smaller "preparatory" group that was preparing to transfer on to four-year colleges and universities. In their discussions of the nature of a "terminal education," the community-junior college national spokesmen revealed much about the type of society which they valued and tried to propagate.

While the community-junior national spokesmen attempted to explain the nature of terminal education in simple terms, it was no simple concept. They attempted to divide the concept into two component parts: vocational education, or preparation for jobs; and general education, or the development of social intelligence. Curricula should be built, they argued, to reflect the dual nature of terminal education. But when they discussed vocational education separately, they felt compelled to emphasize that the development of technical skills alone was not enough; they added that a good vocational education had to develop values, attitudes, and behaviors which would produce loyal, co-operative, and trustworthy employees. Likewise, when they tried to discuss general education in isolation, they generally included the importance of vocational preparation and learning socially useful skills as a necessary part of preparing for a good life. The actual meanings attached to terminal education were complex and wide-ranging, and this chapter will attempt to explore many of them, but the complicated nature of the concept did not seem to divide community-junior college national spokesmen. They remained united in the concept, not because of any agreement on actual curricula proposed as terminal education but because of the idea that something had to be done to improve the lot of a social class unfit by nature or circumstances to receive a university education. In the main, it was their agreement upon the nature of man and the necessary structure for society that permitted them to campaign for terminal education. They wrote less of "efficiency" and more of "intelligence," but their view of man and society was not far from the elitist, social Darwinistic, efficient society envisioned by Harper, Jordan, and Lange.

Koos, Eells, and Campbell

Before launching into an analysis of the central role played by the concept of terminal education in the developing community-junior college ideology, an introduction of the prominent community-junior college national spokesmen during the 1920's and 1930's, as identified in this study, is in order. Extensive introductions will be provided to the identities and the basic ideas of the spokesmen, fourteen in all, in order to fix all of them in the reader's mind. In the analysis by topic which follows the introduction of the spokesmen, many of their ideas will be considered further. Of the fourteen spokesmen writing books and articles on the community-junior college movement from 1920 to 1941, three stand out as the most prolific as well as the most often quoted writers--Leonard V. Koos, Walter Crosby Eells, and Doak S. Campbell.

All three men were professors of education--Koos at Chicago, Eells at Stanford, and Campbell at George Peabody. Since their careers were tied to universities, it is not surprising to find them leading the field of national spokesmen in published writings, for the university standard of promotion through publication was already well established in their time and at their institutions. Their voluminous writings were influential as well, attested to by the numerous times they were quoted in the writings of other community-junior college leaders and by the positions the three educators were accorded in the American Association of Junior Colleges. Of the three, Leonard V. Koos was the major figure.

Leonard V. Koos (1881-) was born in Chicago to German immigrant parents and did not learn the English language until he was sent to school. His father, a tailor, moved his family from town to town in Illinois and Iowa in search of a good business location while Leonard was growing up. He finally settled in Aurora, Illinois, where the family enjoyed moderate prosperity. When Leonard finished high school in 1898, he became an apprentice pants-maker and supplemented his meager income by playing evenings in an Aurora band. He soon became dissatisfied with the direction in which his life was heading and began looking around for opportunities to improve his lot in life.[1]

---

[1] The biographical information on Koos' life, unless otherwise noted is from George Conger, III, "Leonard V. Koos: His Contribution to American Education During Half a Century" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1968).

Koos launched his career in education when he responded to an advertisement in 1900 for a position as the teacher of a one-room school house in the village of Minooka about fifty miles from Aurora. He became enthralled in teaching and began reading extensively to improve his knowledge; by the end of his first year of teaching he was convinced that he should pursue a college education. A Congregational minister persuaded Koos that Oberlin College in Ohio was right for him, and he entered that college in 1902. Oberlin was a rich experience for Koos. His mind was opened to many of the ideas of the Progressive Era: he gained the nickname "Peace Koos" by winning the senior oratory contest with a speech titled "The United States of the World"; and he worked for two summers after receiving his B.A. from Oberlin as Director of Progress City in Cleveland--a program for underprivileged youth at Hiram House, a George Bellamy settlement house.

Koos began a seven-year career as a superintendent of schools after leaving Oberlin in 1907 which took him from Shabbona, Illinois, to Red Lake Falls, Minnesota, and finally to Glencoe, Minnesota. His moves were inspired by salary increases and by opportunities to increase vocational programs and to undertake school reorganizations. His interest in the reorganization of the secondary school system led him to seek out Charles H. Judd, a nationally known figure in the long-standing and widespread campaign to gain economy in time by reorganizing and shortening elementary and secondary education, at the University of Chicago. Koos determined that his career could be furthered by a master's degree from Chicago, and he entered that institution in the summer of 1914 with that goal in mind. Judd enticed Koos to remain for the Ph.D., however, by arranging for Koos to be made Executive Secretary for The Committee on the Definition of the Unit, of which Judd was a member, a committee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Using this project for his doctoral dissertation, the final defense of which lasted less than fifteen minutes, Koos received the Ph.D. in the spring of 1916, eight quarters after beginning his work for the master's degree. Judd helped Koos find his first university post as Associate Professor of Education at the University of Washington, which he held for three years before moving to the University of Minnesota in 1919. After a successful decade at Minnesota, Koos was attracted back to the University of Chicago where he taught from 1929 to his retirement in 1946.

Koos' retirement from Chicago led to his first formal association with AAJC, an organization before which he had given dozens of speeches; from 1946 to 1949 he served as editor of the Junior College Journal, published by AAJC, and as the Association's Director of Research.[1] Koos has continued to study, teach, and write about junior colleges into the 1970's.[2]

Koos' work for The Committee on the Definition of the Unit marked his entry into national prominence as an expert on secondary education. His published dissertation resulting from the committee's study was largely a mass of data systematized in hundreds of charts and tables, revealing his enthusiasm for organizing data which persisted throughout his career. Following the efforts toward standardization in education that had been made by NEA's Committee of Ten and its Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education and the College Entrance Examination Board, Koos' study for The Committee on the Definition of the Unit provided a digest of class time and credit standards for use by secondary school administrators.[1]

---

[1] Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 52.

[2] At age 89, Koos published a 580 page book: The Community College Student (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970).

Koos' interest in the general reorganization of secondary education, stimulated by Charles H. Judd, at first centered on the junior high school. His first commercially published book contained arguments in support of junior high schools which he later transferred intact to support junior colleges: they would keep more youth in school and off the streets, provide economy of time, allow for individual differences and encourage a commitment toward a vocation, provide better teaching, insure sharper scholarly standards, and in general be geared to meet all of the demands of a particular stage of adolescence in a child's life.[2] Koos once told interviewers that his interest in junior colleges resulted in part from his study of junior high schools, stimulating a desire to establish separate administrative units for the last two years of adolescence just as the junior high school would accommodate the first two years.[3]

Charles H. Judd and President Lotus Coffman of the University of Minnesota suggested Koos' name to officials of the Commonwealth Fund of New York City who desired to support a study of junior colleges. With a grant of ten thousand dollars, Koos began the first major study of the junior college movement.[1] It resulted in a two-volume, data-packed publication by the University of Minnesota in 1924 and in a condensed, more readable commercial publication in 1925;[2] it also resulted in Koos' becoming the major figure in the junior college field. Early in his study, Koos reported that a shift in the purposes of the junior college was taking place, and he made it clear that he believed it to be in a positive direction. Although the original purpose of the junior college had clearly been to prepare students for the university, Koos reported, the literature of the junior college field and statements in junior colleges, which Koos systematically analyzed, contained increasing emphasis upon general and occupational training for students not continuing their education.[3] When his study was completed, Koos had amassed an impressive array of survey studies and cogent arguments to support new directions for the junior college. In particular, Koos emphasized two areas which his analysis determined were of basic importance, in addition to the established transfer function, in the continuing development of the junior college movement: (1) democratizing higher education and (2) exerting conserving and socializing influences upon youth.

---

[1] Leonard V. Koos, The Administration of Secondary-School Units, Supplementary Educational Monographs, I, 3 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1917).

[2] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior High School (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1920).

[3] George R. Conger and Raymond E. Schultz, "Leonard V. Koos: Patriarch of the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XL (March, 1970), 28.

Koos cited the statistical distributions of the army alpha test from World War One to support the contention that there are many individuals deserving of an education beyond high school although not mentally capable of mastering a four-year course. He employed the term "semi-professional" to apply to a vocational level higher than the trades but below the professions which would be appropriate for the class of student attending junior colleges. Koos used the term "mental democratization" to mean the right of all to receive the type of education suitable to their intellect, and he saw the junior college as a means to such "democratization."[1]

---

[1] McDowell's 1919 study, mentioned in Chapter II, could be considered the first major study of the junior college movement, but it was merely a questionnaire survey with incomplete and sometimes questionable returns. Koos was characteristically thorough, travelling over 20,000 miles visiting 70 institutions and receiving a high rate of response to his carefully constructed questionnaires.

[2] Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, 2 vols., A Research Publication of the University of Minnesota, Education Series, No. 5 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924); Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College Movement (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925).

[3] Leonard V. Koos, "Current Conceptions of the Special Purposes of the Junior College," School Review, XXIX (September, 1921), 520-529.

The contribution that Koos thought that the junior college could make by exerting "a conserving and socializing influence" on youth was two-fold; first, it would allow students to begin college earlier and thus conserve time; and second, it would allow the moral influence of the home to continue to act upon the student through all of his difficult adolescent years. The conservation of time idea, which of course was very attractive to educators attuned to the ideal of efficiency, resulted from a study that Koos did at the University of Minnesota comparing university and junior college students, in which it was found junior college students, for no obvious reason, entered college about six months younger in age than did university students. More important in Koos' promotion of the junior college than efficiency in time, however, was the socialization aspect of the junior college. Not only would the junior college extend the influence of the home, Koos argued, but it would allow more individual attention to students likely to lose their way, morally speaking, at a large university. There would be more opportunities for leadership training in the smaller student clubs and athletic teams, developing in students the proper attitude of citizenship.[2]

---

[1] Koos, The Junior College Movement, pp. 118-121.

[2] Ibid., pp. 170-173.

Koos did not suggest that the junior college should abandon its function of preparing some students for transfer to universities, which he labeled the "Isthmian Function" since it connected the mainland of elementary and secondary education with the peninsula of professional and advanced academic training. In fact, Koos performed some of the first studies demonstrating that junior college transfers do as well academically at the university as do native junior and senior students.[1] But his emphasis upon non-transfer functions, particularly the goal of educating a semiprofessional class of workers, trained to be good citizens, keynoted a junior college crusade that would last for decades.

Koos was committed to secondary education and opposed to the idea that the junior college was part of higher education. When the University of Minnesota offered him the opportunity to become the first Professor of Higher Education in the nation in 1926, he declined because of his conviction that the junior college movement, with which he was becoming increasingly identified, was a part of secondary and not higher education.[2] He assisted in the strenuous but unsuccessful effort throughout the 1920's and 1930's to integrate the last two years of high school with the junior college and the first two years of high school with the junior high school, producing a six-year elementary school, a four-year junior high school, and a four-year junior college (the 6-4-4 plan).[3] Koos' arguments on behalf of the 6-4-4 plan carried much of the efficiency-oriented language of Harper, Lange, and Jordan, but in addition Koos stressed the need for fourteen years of education for one particular class of people.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 92-96. [2] Conger, "Leonard V. Koos," p. 73.

[3] Leonard V. Koos, "Conditions Favor Integration of Junior Colleges With High Schools," School Life, XII (May, 1927), 164.

A better organized system of secondary education would provide, to Koos' way of thinking, a democratic method of guiding young people toward their place in society--one that supposedly would not involve the ruthless selection process which Koos charged characterized the universities:

> From the standpoint of the right of the less capable students to complete college and university curricula four to eight years in length, the large-scale elimination now characteristic of our higher institutions is not entirely without justification. It is only when faced by our American aspirations for democracy of educational opportunity that this elimination, with its accompanying ruthless disruptions of life plans, appears intolerable, especially as few, if any, of those eliminated fall below in mental caliber the mid-point of our literate white draft during the World War.[1]

The undemocratic selection process in secondary education as depicted by George S. Counts[2] which operated subconsciously in teachers and perpetuated social classes, Koos maintained, needed to be replaced by the process of "distribution," which would be a "quite conscious policy of distributing school attendants more effectively within the complex ramifications of the modern school system.[3] Without attempting an explanation of the reasons, Koos asserted that distribution is "much more in keeping with the spirit of a popularized and democratized education than is selection."[4] Koos saw distribution as part of the guidance function of the junior college, and his ideas will be analyzed further in this regard later.

Throughout the period under study, Koos remained consistent in his ideas. He continually emphasized the important role of the junior college in providing terminal curricula which would distribute students, properly guided, into a variety of semiprofessional areas; he never neglected to stress the importance of general social attitudes, or "social intelligence," as a basic aspect of training for semiprofessions; and he regularly advocated the 6-4-4 plan of educational organization. His influence, difficult to measure, must have been great. Reluctant to join formal organizations, he nevertheless was a popular speaker before many. He conducted several state-supported studies of junior colleges, and directed the first national study of secondary education funded by the U.S. Congress in 1929. During the 1930's he edited the School Review at the University of Chicago. Many of the other community-junior college leaders selected for this study have written of Koos' influence on their ideas about education, including his ex-students B. Lamar Johnson, S. V. Martorana, and Leland Medsker as well as George F. Zook, James M. Wood, James Reynolds, and Jesse P. Bogue.[1] He has written or co-authored 17 books, 132 articles appearing in 38 various journals, and published over two dozen various yearbooks, bulletins, and surveys.[2]

---

[1] Leonard V. Koos, "The Junior College," in Higher Education in America, ed. by Raymond A. Kent (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1930), pp. 13-14.

[2] George S. Counts, The Selective Character of American Secondary Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922).

[3] Koos refers to Counts specifically in The Junior College Movement, p. 148. The definition of "distribution" comes from Leonard V. Koos, "The Junior College Curriculum," School Review, XXXV (November, 1927), 669.

[4] Koos, "The Junior College Curriculum," p. 669.

Walter Crosby Eells (1886-1963) was raised in the northwestern section of the nation and remained in the west during most of his career, striking an interesting geographical counterbalance to the midwesterner, Koos, and the next leader to be considered, Doak S. Campbell, who was from the South. Published biographical information about Eells is slight, limited to Who's Who and scattered editorial comments in his books and articles. He graduated from Whitman College in Walla Walla, Washington, in 1908, and then began two years of high school teaching. He went to the University of Chicago, three years before Koos' arrival there, for a master's degree.

---

[1] Conger, "Leonard V. Koos," pp. 90-106. [2] Ibid., p. 108.

After receiving the degree at the end of one year, Eells returned to his alma mater, Whitman College, in 1911, as a professor of mathematics. Interested in applied mathematics, mechanics, and surveying, Eells was brought to the United States Naval Academy from 1913 to 1916 as an instructor in mathematics and mechanics, and he spent the summer of 1916 teaching surveying at Harvard. He returned to Whitman College and taught there until 1927, during which time he was able to obtain a Ph.D. degree in education from Stanford University. He was then accepted into the Stanford faculty, becoming a full professor in four years and remaining in that capacity until 1938.

The interest in junior colleges that Eells developed at Stanford was soon directed into an important national channel--the editorship of the Junior College Journal, a publication of the American Association of Junior Colleges. The Association, established in 1920, had survived ten years without a regular journal, and it accepted an offer from Stanford University in 1930 of offices, clerical help, a publishing subsidy, and the part-time services of Eells as editor to initiate a national journal. Stanford continued the support and Eells continued as editor until 1945.[1] Upon retirement of Doak S. Campbell as AAJC Executive Secretary in 1938, Eells stepped into that position which he kept until 1945. Eells was an energetic, strong-willed man, eventually ousted from his leadership of AAJC amidst charges that he was running a "one-man show."[2] The force of his ideas, however, continued long after the personal conflicts that occasioned his resignation had subsided.

Eells, like most of the community-junior college national spokesmen during this era, centered his attention primarily upon the need for junior colleges to develop terminal education. Shortly after his appointment to Stanford University, Eells instituted a California State Mental-Education Survey with a grant from the council of Research in the Social Sciences and the American Council on Education, and with the endorsement of the state's Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools.[1] Eells had some preliminary data from the Mental-Education Survey to share with delegates to the 1929 AAJC Convention in Atlantic City which underscored his concern about terminal education. Eells reported that 90.4 percent of the California junior college students surveyed expressed an intention to continue their education beyond the junior college. Eells found this statistic alarming:

---

[1] Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 104. [2] Ibid., p. 44.

> It will be most unfortunate if the junior college becomes so successful as a popularizing agency that it makes all of its students plan on full university courses. Probably the proportion of those continuing should be nearer fifty than ninety per cent. This report of ninety per cent is a distinct danger signal ahead.[2]

In 1936, Eells had further evidence to sound an alarm for terminal education. With follow-up data on nearly 7,000 California junior college students who had indicated in 1929 that they intended to continue their education in some particular four-year college or university, Eells reported that only a quarter of the students actually made the intended transfer, and of that quarter only half had graduated by 1936. Even considering the impact of the depression and the unknown numbers who continued their education at some different institution than that indicated in 1929, Eells observed, the study revealed a serious junior college problem. The first implication that Eells drew from the results was that the majority of junior college students, regardless of their stated intentions, were, in fact, if not in name, "terminal students." Secondly, junior colleges were remiss in not "devising, perfecting, and popularizing suitable terminal curricula, both of the semiprofessional type and of the general civic, cultural, or social intelligence type." Thirdly, Eells maintained that students should be made aware of these facts through educational guidance so that they would understand that there was a reasonable doubt of their success. Finally, Eells suggested that the data indicated that the entrance requirements of four-year colleges and universities were too rigid and should be relaxed for qualified junior college graduates.[1]

---

[1] Letter from Eells to California Junior College Executives, April 16, 1929, AAJC Archives. Also see by Eells, The California Junior College Mental-Education Survey (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1930).

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, "California Junior Colleges Through the Eyes of Their Students," Proceedings of the Tenth Annual AAJC Meeting (Atlantic City, N.J., 1929), p. 131.

Eells produced a textbook on junior colleges in 1931 which became the basic source for people interested in the junior college throughout the nation.[2] He allotted a chapter to each of four basic functions, first identified in a 1926 dissertation by Frank Waters Thomas,[3] that junior colleges should perform--(1) the popularizing function; (2) the preparatory function; (3) the terminal function; and (4) the guidance function. These four functions became standard aims in the literature of community-junior college national spokesmen throughout the 1930's. The popularizing function, simply stated, was the aim of keeping increasing numbers of youth in school beyond the twelfth grade. The junior college was not advocated for all youth at this time, but only those intelligent enough to at least achieve semiprofessional status. The preparatory function was of course well accepted, and no junior college leaders opposed the idea of continuing to prepare students for transfer to other institutions of higher education. Eells warned in this regard, however, that junior colleges needed to guard against encouraging students to attempt transfer work who might more wisely pursue terminal courses.[1] It was in support of the terminal and guidance functions that Eells constructed the strongest cases, for these were areas that he considered harmfully neglected.

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, "Intentions of Junior College Students," *Junior College Journal*, VII (October, 1936), 3-10.

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, *The Junior College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931).

[3] Frank Waters Thomas, "A Study of Functions of the Public Junior College and the Extent of Their Realization in California" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1926).

Eells began his case for the terminal function by citing without reference the fact that less than ten percent of the population is needed by society in the professions. If the junior college were going to popularize higher education, Eells maintained, then it must provide curricula that would be suitable for the increasing number of students entering its doors. From a study of 279 junior college catalogues he determined that those institutions were doing a poor job of meeting this need. In his discussion of terminal education, Eells presented a problem that escaped most of his contemporary junior college writers who assumed that merely offering of terminal curricula would naturally attract suitable students; Eells recognized the popularity of the preparatory program:

> For awhile, terminal courses must be more than offered; they must be made attractive. Students cannot be forced to take them it is true, but perhaps they can be led, enticed, attracted.[2]

Eells' perceptive observation that students might continue to choose preparatory programs even when offered the alternative of "more suitable" terminal programs led him to place a great deal of emphasis upon the guidance function of junior colleges. He presented evidence from his California Junior College Mental-Education Survey that the bottom five percent of California junior college males, as measured by the Thurstone Intelligence Test, stated that they intended to continue their education beyond the junior college.[1] Three of the four functions of the junior college--popularization, terminal education, and guidance--needed to be complementary efforts, according to Eells, to train a semiprofessional class of people in keeping with their abilities to meet the needs of society.

---

[1] Eells, The Junior College, p. 260. [2] Ibid., p. 310.

In 1940 Eells directed a national study of terminal education in junior colleges, about which more will be said later, and expanded his ideas for new terminal curricula. Recognizing that a terminal education needed to provide students with both a better living and a better life, Eells reiterated the commonly accepted dualism, with mention of considerable overlapping, between courses "designed to develop cultural aspects, civic training and what has been termed social intelligence" and courses with "a semiprofessional aspect, designed to develop occupational, vocational and technical skills and competence."[2] Eells suggested that forty percent of a course of study could be devoted to each aspect, leaving twenty percent for optional courses.[3]

Elaborating upon the economic and social factors requiring increased terminal curricula, Eells constructed a wide-ranging argument for terminal education. He discussed the closing of the western frontier and the resulting inability of youth to find opportunity in farming inexpensive public land. He reiterated the lack of space in the professions, revising his percentage estimate downward from ten to six percent of the population that could fit into that class. Age factors such as longer life spans, the increasing age of permanent job entry, and the public aversion to child labor were included in the list of factors underlying the need for terminal education. Also in the list were the mobility of the population, the rising crime rate among youth, and the threat of unemployment in a technological age. Nor did Eells forget to include the necessity for increased citizenship training and the economic and social advantages to families of boarding young college students at home, factors commonly mentioned in support of terminal education.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 331.

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, Why Junior College Terminal Education?, Terminal Education Monograph No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: AAJC, 1941), p. 8

[3] Ibid., p. 10.

A great deal of Eells' view of man and of society is revealed in the following passage relating to citizenship training in terminal education. Distinguishing between university education for leadership and terminal education for followship, he asserted:

> Increasingly is there need for young people to be prepared better for civic responsibility, social understanding, home duties and responsibilities, law observance, and devotion to democracy. At a time when the democratic way of life and of government is on trial as never before, it is essential to have a well-educated and intelligent citizenry. Educated leadership is not sufficient. Educated followship is also essential. On the whole the university tends to select and educate young people of superior native ability and intelligence. In a democracy, however, the vote of the citizen of moderate or inferior native ability counts quite as much in the ballot box as the vote of the genius.[2]

With Eells as with Koos, an elitism supposedly based upon scientific measures of intelligence underlaid his repetitive emphasis upon junior college terminal education.

---

[1] _Ibid._, pp. 14-40. [2] _Ibid._, p. 29.

Doak S. Campbell (1888-) was a Southern educator who came to the support of terminal education in junior colleges with many of the same ideas as Koos and Eells. Born in an Arkansas log cabin, Campbell was raised and educated in Arkansas, receiving a bachelor's degree from Quachita College, a Baptist institution, in 1911. Remaining in Arkansas, Campbell spent four years as principal and a teacher in a high school in Columbus, Arkansas, and then moved to Little Rock to work for a year as State Secretary of Baptist Sunday School and Young Peoples' Work. In 1916, Campbell joined the staff of Central College in Conway, Arkansas, where his first year included teaching chemistry and biology as well as directing the college orchestra. Within four years, he was President of Central College, and during his eight years in the presidency he converted the Baptist college from a faltering four-year girls' college into a thriving girls' junior college. He entered actively into the national junior college movement and was selected as Executive Secretary of AAJC in 1922, when the Association was only two years old.[1]

A college president at age 31 and the executive secretary of a national association at age 33, Campbell still felt the need to advance his own educational qualifications. When he was 38 he left Central College to pursue graduate study at George Peabody College in Nashville, Tennessee, and there he received a master's degree after one year and a Ph.D. degree two years after that. He stayed on at Peabody working in the Division of Surveys and Field Studies, conducting many of the same type of studies done by Eells at Stanford and Koos at Minnesota and Chicago. Campbell's interests broadened, and he did not maintain a primary interest in junior colleges throughout his career. In 1938 he was appointed Dean of the Graduate College at Peabody and resigned his demanding but non-paying position as Executive Secretary for AAJC. In 1941 he was selected for the presidency of Florida State College for Women in Tallahassee and was no longer a national spokesman for community-junior colleges, although he did act as Chairman of the AAJC Commission on Junior College Terminal Education which authorized the study that Eells directed.

---

[1] Unless otherwise noted, the biographical information on Campbell comes from John Fawcett, Jr., "Doak S. Campbell and Southern Education" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966).

Two active interests which Campbell maintained all the while he was AAJC Executive Secretary were not directly reflected in his junior college writings but contributed greatly to his general thinking (this becomes apparent in his post-war writings to be considered in the next chapter)--religious education and Southern education. From his college days at Quachita to the presidency of Florida State College, Campbell remained an active Sunday School teacher. He was active in local, state, and national Baptist educational undertakings, often serving as a consultant. After retirement, he wrote a column for the Western Recorder, a weekly Baptist publication. Campbell's position with the Division of Surveys and Field Studies at Peabody, serving as director from 1934 to 1938, involved him in many ideas and projects to develop Southern education. Generally speaking, he championed increased vocational and citizenship training at all educational levels and envisioned educational channels appropriate to the natural abilities of individuals, a stance in perfect accord with the prevailing ideas on junior college terminal education. His involvement with research projects on Southern education brought him into contact with the prestigious General Education Board, a contact he was later able to use to the advantage of AAJC.

Although Campbell became the Executive Secretary of AAJC in 1922, his writings on the junior college movement were sparse until the 1930's. His doctoral dissertation was a national study of stated aims of junior colleges, and its publication in 1930 produced an updating of Koos' 1924 study.[1] Like Koos, Campbell reviewed junior college purposes stated in college catalogues and in the literature of the field; he did not do the extensive traveling to junior colleges that Koos did, but he did receive good questionnaire results allowing him to consider actual junior college practices too. Campbell did not uncover any new or additional statements of purpose for junior colleges, but he was able to demonstrate decisively that the terminal function, strongly supported in the general literature, was weakly represented in actual junior college offerings. A strong interest was expressed by Campbell, which he shared more with Koos than Eells, in overall educational reorganization. He criticized junior colleges for failing to take their place squarely within secondary education, fitting their practices to the later stage of adolescence. Reminiscent of the ideas of Harper, Jordan, and Lange, Campbell urged greater efficiency and economy of time in education by integrating junior college work with high school work.[2]

It is interesting to compare the four categories of junior college purposes identified by Campbell with the earlier list of four categories developed by Thomas and disseminated by Eells. In three cases they were the same--preparatory, terminal, and popularizing functions; they differed on the fourth function, which was "guidance" in the Thomas-Eells categorization and "democratization" in Campbell's listing. The two functions were not as different as their terminology indicates, however, since under "democratization" Campbell included providing opportunities, in keeping with local needs, for groups of students less than college caliber.[1] All things considered, the major works of Koos, Eells and Campbell reflect the same concern for developing new educational channels to direct youth into "useful and suitable" positions in society.

---

[1] Doak S. Campbell, A Critical Study of the Stated Purposes of the Junior College, Contribution to Education No. 70 (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930).

[2] Ibid., pp. 80-83.

Campbell, like Koos, often spoke of the democratizing mission of the junior college, but his meaning, also like that of Koos, was quite elitist. For instance, addressing the Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association in 1931, Campbell stated two "widely-accepted" conditions necessary for education to be considered democratic:

> (1) It must be available to all persons alike, supposedly upon equal terms; and (2) it must provide training suitable to the needs of those it serves.[2]

Campbell then went on to mention Thomas Jefferson's advice to rake geniuses from the rubbish annually and send them on at public expense; Campbell editorialized:

> His reference to "rubbish" has a strangely familiar and modern sounding to those who have been concerned with the transfer of graduates of secondary schools to American higher institutions.[3]

Campbell also offered George S. Counts' The Selective Character of American Secondary Education as evidence that better methods of selection were needed, concluding that it was due time to substitute action for discussion:

> There is no doubt that the same arguments are made for wide distribution of public junior colleges as have

---

[1] Ibid., p. 31.

[2] Doak S. Campbell, "The Public Junior College--An Agent of Democracy--The Social Aspects," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals, XXXV (March, 1931), 150.

[3] Ibid., p. 151.

> been made for making high school advantages universal in this country. The offering of educational opportunities which will fit one for citizenship and for a degree of independence at what ever level he may be forced by social or economic pressure out of the school system, lends itself readily to theoretical discussion, but in actual practice has little to show by way of accomplishment.[1]

The junior college, thought Campbell, could do much in the actual arena of practice, as well as in theory, to fit individuals for their various levels.

Koos, Eells, and Campbell purported to write descriptive studies of the rapidly growing junior college movement in the 1920's and 1930's, but their evaluations of progress achieved revealed clearly their ideological bent. Later in this chapter their more crusading articles will be analyzed, but it should already be recognized that these educators were marshalling arguments under the banner of democracy which idealized an efficient, orderly, stratified, and stable society, based upon the supposedly stratified qualities of human nature, very close to the society envisioned by Harper, Jordan, and Lange. Their common emphasis upon the need for more terminal curricula and the need to guide individuals into them was made possible by their common view of human nature and their acceptance of the demands of an industrialized society.

If Harper, Jordan, and Lange can be considered the prophets of the junior college movement, then Koos, Eells, and Campbell can be considered its generals in the field. Such an analogy occurred to George F. Zook, once United States Commissioner of Education and himself a community-junior college national spokesman; on the twentieth anniversary of AAJC he addressed the assembled delegates, paying tribute to the prophetic vision of early leaders such as Harper, Jordan and Lange and praising contemporary junior college leadership as follows:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 153.

> . . . it cannot really be said that there was a junior college movement in this country until the Junior College Association, powerfully reinforced by General Koos and later by Colonels Eells and Campbell, organized the brave but struggling frontiersmen into an army which ever since has been fathering recruits on all hands and has even stormed its way into the New England citadel. You will notice that I refer to these latter three gentlemen in military terms rather than in religious ones because I assume that like saints a prophet has to be dead for quite awhile before he is accorded this merited recognition. I need not tell you that these three gentlemen are very much alive. Hence I hope we don't have to call them prophets for many years yet. There are a few battles yet to be fought and we may need them sorely.[1]

Other Community-Junior College National Spokesmen During the 1920's and 1930's

If one wished to carry Zook's military analogy further, the other community-junior college national spokesmen in this study during the 1920's and 1930's could be considered colonels and lieutenants. The colonels--L. W. Smith, Nicholas Ricciardi, John W. Harbeson, James M. Wood, and George F. Zook--will be discussed in some detail in this section; the lieutenants--Jesse P. Bogue, C. C. Colvert, B. Lamar Johnson, Leland Medsker, and James Reynolds--will only be briefly introduced in this chapter since the days of their generalship came after 1941 and their ideas will be the central focus of the next chapter. Robert M. Hutchins really escapes the analogy altogether, unless one were to consider him a leader in an allied army or a veteran of a previous war, but his ideas on the junior college will be included because he met the publishing criteria of the study and because his ideas pose an interesting contrast to the prevailing ideas within the community-junior college movement.

---

[1] George F. Zook, "The Past Twenty Years--The Next Twenty Years," Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 618.

L. W. Smith (1876-1952) was born in Ohio, educated in the public schools of that state, and graduated in 1902 with a bachelor's degree from Denison University in Granville, Ohio, where William Rainey Harper once taught. He began teaching English in Aurora, Illinois, only a few years after Leonard V. Koos left that city to begin a teaching career elsewhere. From 1908 to 1919, Smith served as the principal of Thornton Township High School in Harvey, Illinois, and in that position he was able to do graduate work at the University of Chicago, receiving a master's degree in 1913 and a Ph.D. in 1919. With his new doctorate, Smith moved to the superintendency of Joliet Township High School and Junior College, thus locating himself within a rich vein of junior college history. Smith remained at Joliet until 1928 when he accepted the position of Superintendent of Schools at Berkeley, California, which he held to 1936. In his later years, Smith worked as Director of the American College Bureau and as a research fellow for the University of California, but his major involvement in the junior college movement was limited to pre-World War Two years.[1]

Just prior to moving to Joliet, Smith attracted national attention by instituting a program to "Americanize" alien workers; the recent revolution in Russia and the rise of the Red Scare in the United States insured an audience receptive to his ideas. He won support from local factory owners in Harvey for the Americanization program after explaining to them that it would make the workers more efficient, more satisfied in their work, and "less susceptible to various types of detrimental agitation."[2] Some employers became so enthusiastic that they made their employees attend the program to keep their jobs. With English tests, intelligence tests, and several levels of English and American Government courses, Smith "Americanized" nearly five hundred factory workers in 1919.[1]

---

[1] The biographical information concerning L. W. Smith comes mostly from Who Was Who in America, Vol. III: 1951-1960, p. 798.

[2] L. W. Smith, "Americanization in the Thornton Township High School," School Review, XXVIII (November, 1920), 660.

At Joliet, Smith continued to sell local businessmen on the advantages of blending instruction in good civic behavior with vocational training, and he recommended the procedure to other educational leaders anxious to increase public support for industrial education.[2] Like most other community-junior college national spokesmen during this era, Smith insisted that the junior college remain firmly attached to secondary education. He began his 1926 presidency of AAJC with a strong appeal to convention delegates to make clear that, regardless of its form, the junior college was a part of secondary education.[3] This advice was offered in regard to the debate over two-year versus four-year junior colleges, a debate that continued throughout the 1920's and 1930's. Smith himself favored the 6-4-4 plan, but his primary concern was the maintenance of an integral relationship between the junior high school and the high school which would allow a co-ordinated effort to guide students into appropriate areas.[4] Each unit in secondary education would have a different function, as Smith explained to delegates to the University of Illinois high school conference in November, 1927: the high school would terminate the education of those students suitable for a vocation in the trades; and the junior college would terminate the education of those suitable for a semiprofessional level. He told the assembled educators:

---

[1] _Ibid_.

[2] L. W. Smith, "Industrial Education at Joliet Township High School," _Industrial Education Magazine_, XXIV (June, 1923), 359-364.

[3] L. W. Smith, "The Junior College, a Two, Four, or Six Year Institution?," _Proceedings of the Sixth Annual AAJC Meeting_ (Chicago, 1926) p. 11.

[4] L. W. Smith, "Significance of the Junior College Movement," _Chicago Schools Journal_, XI (October, 1928), 43.

> There are large groups of students who go to the high schools of America who should be trained for certain routine positions in our American life--the trades, the skilled clerical occupations, the skilled mercantile occupations. This can all be done on the traditional high school level.[1]

The separate functions of various units within secondary education, however, were all to be part of the general process of efficiently guiding students into positions in life, vocationally and socially, which were "suitable" to them.

Nicholas Ricciardi is not listed in any biographical reference source, and thus personal data about him are limited and sketchy. His professional career was spent in California, beginning in the 1920's as State Commissioner of Vocational Education. For most of the 1930's he served as Chief of the California State Division of Secondary Education within the State Department of Education, leaving that post in 1938 to become the president of San Bernadino Valley Junior College in California. Four years later he left southern California and moved 400 miles north to become the president of Sacramento Junior College.

Considering himself an "industrial educator," Ricciardi maintained a steady interest throughout this period in vocational education in the junior college. His writings consistently emphasized, however, the social rather than the technological benefits that would result from properly devised terminal curricula. In one of his first published articles, Ricciardi answered the question of "For what occupations should the state prepare its workers?" thusly:

---

[1] L. W. Smith, "The Significance of the Junior College Movement," Proceedings of the High School Conference, November, 1927 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1928), p. 39.

> The state should prepare its workers for the right occupations: and the right occupations are those which are best suited to the capacities and vocational interests of the individuals and which in addition meet the needs of society.[1]

Elaborating upon this rather vague reply to his rhetorical question, Ricciardi explained that social problems would result from allowing too many students to drift "unnaturally" into higher education; an efficient society could not allow such inefficient education. Ricciardi saw high school students existing in three groups: (1) those capable of a higher education; (2) those compelled by law to be in high school but not intellectually competent; and (3) "those more or less seriously interested in getting the training they need for the kind of work they want to do or think they want to do."[2] It was the third group that might need the time provided by the junior college for additional guidance and training. To make certain that the "capacities and vocational interests of the individuals" and the "needs of society" matched, Ricciardi stressed the necessity of "applying science to education" for a true determination.[3]

The conception that Ricciardi held of individual capacities and social needs was simplistically explained in an article two years later.[4] Every individual, according to Ricciardi, has five fundamental capacities--mental, physical, moral, co-operation, and craft capacities:

> His mental capacity is the ability to acquire, to coordinate and to apply ideas. His physical capacity is the ability to keep in good health and to endure. Moral capacity is the ability to discharge obligations in accordance with generally approved ethical standards. The ability to respect the honest

---

[1] Nicholas Ricciardi, "For What Occupations Should the State Prepare Its Workers?," Industrial Education Magazine, XXVII (November, 1925), 143.

[2] Ibid., p. 141. [3] Ibid., p. 143.

[4] Nicholas Ricciardi, "A Philosophy of Vocational Education and Its Sources," Industrial Education Magazine, XXIX (July, 1927), 7-10.

> convictions of others, to work in harmony with associates, and be loyal to superiors, is cooperation capacity; and craft capacity is the ability to do the kind of work set as the standard of efficiency in the vocation which the individual may pursue.[1]

With his view of human nature, it is little wonder that employers supported Riciardi's attempts to build vocational curricula designed to develop the "natural" capacities for endurance, loyalty, and vocational efficiency.

Ricciardi's analysis of the needs of society for vocational training was equally simple, consisting also in five parts--professional, semiprofessional, skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled vocations.[2] He did not attempt to correlate the five individual capacities with the five vocational areas, but rather implied that individuals capable of a professional vocation would be advanced in all five abilities, and capabilities would decline across-the-board as vocational levels declined.

Ricciardi argued that vocational education was in large part character building, stating that "we know that workers and citizens of character are invariably reliable and efficient individuals." Citing Roger Babson that 65 percent of discharged workers lose their jobs from character deficiencies and only 35 percent are discharged for deficiencies in knowledge and skill, Ricciardi continued his argument:

> Industry is realizing more and more clearly that the heart and the hand function best when the heart is right; and character building makes the heart right.
>
> Industry wants well-trained workers of character. The chief concern of the schools is to train young people so that they may develop into efficient workers and citizens of character. Industry and the schools, therefore, should join hands to establish the kind of training program which will accomplish the ends which they have in common.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 9. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

The reward that society could expect from vocational education in the junior college, according to Ricciardi, was economic and social stability, certainly an attractive commodity to a generation beset by economic depression and social conflict. Learning the importance of a stable dollar, which a vocational curriculum would teach, and learning the importance of a stable home, which would counter the rising divorce rate, were only two examples that Ricciardi offered in his picture of the junior college as a stabilizer of society.[1] Any builder of vocational curricula, Ricciardi advised delegates to the 1940 AAJC Convention, should consider the following remarks of a vocational educator:

> "I can teach a person to become an efficient locksmith, but whether or not he becomes a socially useful citizen depends on what we give him besides the skill and technical knowledge required to make or repair locks; whether he goes out to repair a lock or to pick it will depend on his social understanding."[2]

John W. Harbeson, like Ricciardi, lacks any published biographical sketch. Piecing together scattered editorial references, one can ascertain that he received a bachelor's degree from the University of Kansas in 1911, at which time he became a superintendent and principal of schools in Kansas. Working in Kansas until 1919, Harbeson was able to gain an M.A. from Columbia University in 1916. In 1920, Harbeson made a move to California, eight years before Smith did the same. Harbeson headed for southern California, however, to the Pasadena school system; in 1927 he began a ten year tenure as Principal of Pasadena Junior College, during which time he managed to acquire a Ph.D. from the University of Southern California in 1931.

---

[1] Nicholas Ricciardi, "What May be Expected of the Junior College?," Junior College Journal, V (October, 1934), 10-12.

[2] Nicholas Ricciardi, "Vocational Curricula," Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 598.

Harbeson became principal of Pasadena Junior College in time to help launch a widely publicized experiment in school reorganization--an attempt to establish the 6-4-4 plan in a public school system. Along with John Sexson, the Superintendent of Schools, Harbeson became a nationally known veteran of the campaign to establish public four-year junior colleges.[1] The experiment, although later abandoned by the Pasadena school board, was an encouragement to all those who insisted, as did Koos, Campbell, Smith and Ricciardi, that the junior college should be an integral part of the high school.

A battery of arguments supported the 6-4-4 plan of organization, all of which were in harmony with the prevailing ideological beliefs of community-junior college leaders. First of all, by combining the last two years of high school and the first two years of college in the same four-year institution, it was argued that efficiency could be better obtained. Overlapping in courses could be lessened because the same teachers would be teaching beginning, intermediate, and advanced courses in their fields and would know what work students had already covered.[2] Secondly, the idea continued to be advanced that adolescence continued to approximately an individual's twentieth year, and that his needs could best be met during that stage of growth by a local institution attentive to personal development. But the main reason in favor of the four-year college which Harbeson consistently emphasized was that it could best promote good terminal education. It could do this by: (1) efficiently organizing the general education program for the teaching of good citizenship so that it would be completed by a student's twelfth school year; (2) providing two full years, grades thirteen and fourteen, for training vocational students; and (3) providing a four-year guidance program which would have adequate time to assess, direct, and place vocational students.[1]

---

[1] See John A. Sexson and John W. Harbeson, The New American College: The Four-Year Junior College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946).

[2] John W. Harbeson, "The Pasadena Junior College Experiment," Junior College Journal, II (October, 1931), 9-10.

Harbeson proudly reported in 1938, after ten years of directing the four-year junior college experiment, that more than sixty percent of the students at Pasadena Junior College were enrolled in terminal curricula.[2] This was indeed considered a mark of success by other junior college leaders struggling to find ways to fulfill the terminal function which was increasingly pinpointed as the junior college's primary contribution to American society.

James M. Wood (1875-1958) differed in several ways from other community-junior college national spokesmen in the 1920's and 1930's. He was less of an advocate for terminal education to meet the needs of society and more of an advocate for a child-centered, life-adjustment education. He was the only one of the leaders in this study to affiliate with the Progressive Education Association, and his belief in social reform through the education of the individual is not apparent in the writings of the other community-junior college spokesmen. At the same time, however, Wood and his ideas were not outcasts from the junior college movement; Michael Brick labeled Wood "the moving spirit of the junior college movement" in the early 1920's.[3] The location of the organizational meeting for AAJC in St. Louis, nearby Wood's Stephens College, and the fact that Wood was elected president of the new organization in 1923 and 1924 are indications that he was well accepted in the movement.

---

[1] John W. Harbeson, "Vocational Completion Courses at Pasadena Junior College," California Journal of Secondary Education, XI (November, 1936), 435-437.

[2] John W. Harbeson, "The Experimental Program at Pasadena," Junior College Journal, VIII (April, 1938), 354.

[3] Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 30.

Wood was born in Missouri and was a teacher, principal, and superintendent for ten years before receiving his bachelor's degree from the University of Missouri in 1907. After three more years as a school superintendent in Missouri, Wood went for his master's degree at Columbia, returning to Missouri in 1911 to a position in the Education Department of the State Normal School in Springfield. He was appointed to the presidency of Stephens College for Women in Columbia, Missouri, in 1912, a position he held for thirty-five years.[1] Located in Missouri, Wood witnessed junior college growth coming less from the high schools than from converted four-year colleges. The University of Missouri took the lead in directing this transformation, and by 1916 a Missouri-junior college union had been formed consisting of nine junior colleges, regularly inspected and accredited by the University.[2] In the first four years of Wood's presidency at Stephens, he converted that institution from a four-year college into a junior college, with an attached preparatory school, and brought it into the Missouri-junior college union.

Although Wood did not develop the same view of terminal education as most other junior college leaders, he did take the leadership in support of the 6-4-4 plan of educational reorganization and thus was in tune with an important segment of junior college thought. His opening address to the organizational meeting of AAJC in 1920 was an appeal to implement educational reorganization by building four-year junior colleges with curricula to meet the needs of students rather than the needs of faculty. The question and answer session after Wood's speech showed no opposition to his ideas, with the exception that some were skeptical of granting an A.B. degree, as Wood proposed but never implemented, at the end of a student's fourteenth year of education[1]--a proposal advocated by only one other person studied in this chapter, Robert M. Hutchins.

---

[1] Who Was Who in America, Vol. III: 1951-1960, p. 935.

[2] James M. Wood, "The Junior College," Journal of Education, LXXXIV (July 27, 1916), 92.

Most community-junior college spokesmen, while alert to the need for more terminal curricula, had only vague ideas about the content of such curricula. Wood, on the other hand, began his arguments with a consideration of curricula, and not with a concern for steering the masses away from the professions. Wood's particular ideas on proper curricula for junior colleges will be considered in more detail later; for the present it is important to grasp his basic premise that personal development should be the central focus of each junior college student's curriculum. To implement this idea, Stephens College contracted with Dr. W. W. Charters in 1921 to undertake a long-range study to determine what the personal "needs" of young women really were; Charters arranged for over a thousand women to record their interests and activities on a daily basis and to send him, anonymously, these diaries which he used to construct a curriculum for women.[2]

---

[1] James M. Wood, "The Function of the Junior College," in National Conference of Junior Colleges, 1920, and First Annual Meeting of AAJC, 1921 Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 19 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1922), pp. 2-6.

[2] James M. Wood, "A College Curriculum for Women," in Problems of College Education, ed. by Earl Hundleson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1928), pp. 369-370.

About the same time that Pasadena Junior College became a four-year institution, President Wood appeared before a session of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to ask permission for Stephens College to experiment with a similar eleventh through fourteenth grade system. The North Central Association granted a five-year permit and appointed a three-man committee to keep in contact with the experiment--Charles H. Judd (Chairman), Leonard V. Koos, and George F. Zook. In 1930, after their second visit to Stephens, the committee reported that all was well, complimenting "the vigor and devotion with which Stephens College is contributing to the solution of one of the important problems of junior college organization."[1] As might be expected of Wood, the experiment involved a curricular reorganization and not merely adjoining the traditional last two years of high school work with the traditional first two years of college work. Stephens began their freshmen (eleventh graders) with orientation courses in humanities, social science, natural science, and vocations, along with whatever "tool subjects," such as reading, writings, mathematics, foreign language, that a student might need to pursue his chosen major and minor fields. All specialized major and minor subjects pursued the sophomore year (twelfth grade) began with orientation units tying the specialty to wider human interests. The junior and senior years (grades thirteen and fourteen) permitted increased specialization in selected major and minor areas.[2] In a co-operative venture with a high school at Long Beach, California, and a men's junior college at Menlo Park, California, course ideas and instructors were exchanged to widen the experiment. Evaluation testing disclosed that the ability of high school students to do "college level work" was nearly as great as that of college students, evidence often repeated by other advocates of the 6-4-4 plan of reorganization.[1]

---

[1] "Report on Stephens College," Junior College Journal, I (December, 1930), 161.

[2] James M. Wood, "The Four Year Junior College," Proceedings of the Eighth Annual AAJC Meeting (Chicago, 1928), pp. 47-48.

Although Wood was the president of a private, women's college, his curricular ideas were directed to, and well received by, a wider junior college audience. Private colleges predominated in AAJC until the 1930's, when their influence began to wane, but the differences between public and private junior colleges did not cause much disagreement among junior college leaders.[2] By 1938, however, Wood came to think that the type of junior college he wished to promote would probably have to be a private institution. He identified three types of junior colleges, each with a definite purpose. The local public junior college, stated Wood, had to accommodate large numbers of deprived youth and prepare them "to face life as competent citizens, economically and socially." The second type of junior college, usually fostered by a university, was one characterized by a dominant professional aim and prepared students to enter a higher university level. The third type, said Wood, was "the type which accepts frankly the theory of general education as its basis of practice. It is found in greatest numbers among the private junior colleges." This third type, of course, was Wood's ideal, and his eventual recognition that it was not to be realized in most public junior colleges indicates that a general parting of the ways was taking place between the developing community-junior college and the private junior college, a division that would be ideologically complete by the 1950's.[1]

---

[1] James M. Wood, "Long Beach--Menlo--Stephens Co-operation," Junior College Journal, I (February, 1931), 242-250.

[2] Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 37; L. W. Smith, "Discussion on the Junior College," Proceedings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, XXX, Part II (March, 1925), pp. 56.

George F. Zook was a generalist in higher education rather than a community-junior college specialist, but he was a special friend of the junior college movement and often spoke on its behalf. It was Zook who arranged the first national meeting of junior college leaders in 1920, one of his first acts after becoming Chief of the Division of Higher Education in the U.S. Bureau of Education. He told that group that four-year colleges and universities were "more important for the development of young manhood and intelligent leadership in the solution of . . . complex economic problems," but assured the assembled junior college leaders that the astounding growth rate of college attendance required other types of educational institutions.[2] Zook continued to look upon junior colleges as a safety valve to relieve universities from the pressures of the masses throughout his career, apparently without insult to junior college leaders.

George F. Zook (1885-1951) was raised in Kansas and received both his bachelor and master's degrees from the University of Kansas. He taught history in various universities throughout the nation from 1907 to 1920 and also managed to obtain a Ph.D. from Cornell in 1914. During World War One, Zook worked with the Committee on Public Information, and after the war he was selected as Chief of the Division of Higher Education, acting as specialist in higher education in the U.S. Bureau of Education. In 1925, Zook accepted the presidency of the University of Akron in Ohio, serving in that capacity until 1933 when he returned to Washington, D.C. as U.S. Commissioner of Education, remaining in that position until his retirement in 1950.[1]

---

[1] James M. Wood, "The Junior College and General Education," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals, XXII (May, 1938), 22-23.

[2] Zook, National Conference, pp. 1-2.

Zook cited most of the standard arguments in support of junior colleges, including economic efficiency, the needs of adolescence, and the importance of terminal education, but he emphasized the importance of junior colleges as selection agencies more than most other community-junior college national spokesmen. He told the Harvard Teachers' Association in 1926:

> Much as I see in the field of junior college education, both general and technical, I am not personally so much interested in helping to develop it as I am in what we should properly call higher education. . . . In other words, with the establishment of junior college work on a sound basis, it seems to me that the problem of sifting the fit from the unfit and of selecting those who are capable of advance and professional work from those who should be guided into shorter curricula on the semi-professional level, would largely be solved in the junior college division of the secondary school system.[2]

Zook once responded to Abraham Flexner's criticism that there was no university in America truly devoted to scholarship by answering that it was the unselected mob of freshmen and sophomore students that gave validity to the charge. The advent of the junior college, Zook maintained, would "be the greatest single factor in changing this situation."[3]

The selection process of junior colleges, Zook realized, could also apply to occupational as well as educational advancement of students. To allow ample time for the junior college to perform this selection function,

---

[1] Who Was Who in America, Vol. III: 1951-1960, p. 950.

[2] George F. Zook, "The Junior College Movement," School and Society, XXIII (May 15, 1926), 605.

[3] George F. Zook, "Implications of the Junior College Movement," Junior College Journal, II (February, 1932), 249. Flexner's charge was made in Abraham Flexner, Universities, American, English, German (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930).

Zook favored the 6-4-4 plan. The four-year junior college, Zook argued, would be better for the psychological development of the adolescent and it would be more economical that the 6-3-3-2 form of educational organization. Most of all, however, as he stated before the National Education Association, it would allow a better process of selection:

> . . . the secondary school including the junior college is the great period of occupational selection for a student. In this process of selection he needs constant guidance and help. He needs to be studied as an individual over a series of years for trends and tendencies in his interests until with this help he has made an occupational adjustment for himself.[1]

Robert M. Hutchins (1899-) was a spokesman of sorts for the community-junior college movement, qualifying for this study by a sizeable number of published articles on the topic. But Hutchins was his own man with a unique set of ideas; he was not really actively engaged in the ideological campaign being waged by most community-junior college national spokesmen in support of their movement. Like Harper and Jordan, his conception of the junior college was determined in large part by his idea of what the university should be; it was a residue from a carefully considered position on the role of the university in society.

Parallels can be drawn between the lives and careers of Robert Hutchins and William Rainey Harper. Besides the fact that they were both presidents of the University of Chicago, Hutchins reaching that position at the early age of 30, both were products of Yale University and distinguished themselves as bright young scholars. Hutchins received his law degree from Yale in 1925 and remained on the staff, becoming Dean of the Law School only three years later. The son of a Congregational minister, Hutchins was instructed in metaphysical values at an early age. When he later studied law, he was disturbed by the manner by which law was taught, pragmatically reviewing individual cases in the spirit of "what the court decides, the law is." He believed that general and valid principles must underlie judicial decisions, a belief reinforced by a young Columbia philosopher studying legal philosophy, Mortimer Adler. When Hutchins went to the presidency of the University of Chicago in 1929, he arranged for Adler, who became a continuing influence on his thought, to join the staff of Chicago's law school.[1]

---

[1] George F. Zook, "Relative Merits of the 6-4-4 Plan of Organization," NEA Proceedings, LXX (June, 1932), 517.

Hutchins did not have the problem that perplexed many community-junior college national spokesmen. He was convinced that a junior college education, specifically a general education, should be for everyone. He refused to accept that the type of junior college curriculum should be any different for those preparing for the university than for those preparing for life. All should receive the same basic treatment in the thirteenth and fourteenth grades, according to Hutchins, and it should be an intellectual treatment. The point at which he parted ways most emphatically with junior college leaders was exactly this: he insisted that general education be intellectual and esoteric, while they were convinced that it should be practical and useful.

Hutchins was a foe of practical education, and his major work on higher education, The Higher Learning in America, was a treatise against specialization, vocationalism, and professionalization, and in favor of intellectualism, generalism, and metaphysicalism.[1] All of this really had very little to do with the junior college except that Hutchins was convinced that freshmen and sophomores had no rightful place in universities (with the possible exception of educational experimentation). The place for freshmen and sophomores, Hutchins thought, was in a secondary school system where they could wait out adolescence, avoid an overcrowded job market, and complete a general education exposing them to basic ideas in a variety of academic areas. The simple reason why they should be in the junior college, maintained Hutchins, was economic; there were no jobs for them. He certainly did not attempt to make a case, as all other junior college spokesmen did, for any utilitarian value to junior college or general education.

---

[1] Biographical information on Hutchins, unless otherwise noted, comes from an excellent sketch of his life and ideas in Michael R. Harris, Five Counterrevolutionists in Higher Education (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1970), pp. 133-162.

> The scheme that I advance is based on the notion that general education is education for everybody, whether he goes on to the university or not. It will be useful to him in the university; it will be equally useful if he never goes there. I will admit that it will not be useful to him outside the university in the popular sense of utility. It may not assist him to make money or to get ahead. It may not in any obvious fashion adjust him to his environment or fit him for the contemporary scene. It will, however, have a deeper, wider utility: It will cultivate the intellectual virtues.[2]

In this single paragraph, the thought of which he repeated thousands of times, Hutchins declared his opposition to most of the ideas of the community-junior college national spokesmen in this study. He opposed practical curricula, differentiated curricula according to ability, and life-adjustment curricula, all in a few devastating sentences.

But community-junior college leaders considered Hutchins a friend, if the number of times that they respectively quoted him in their writings and the number of filler quotations from his works in the Junior College Journal are indications of friendship. Their friendship was certainly utilitarian, for they were far from Hutchins' philosophy or curricular suggestions--but he was a distinguished university president spreading to audiences far and wide that the junior college was a good idea. Hutchins, however, saw the junior college as a potential, not an actual, good. The confusion that Hutchins saw besetting all of higher education he saw also besetting junior colleges:

---

[1] Robert M. Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).

[2] Ibid., p. 62.

> It is not clear what the junior college is. In many places it seems to be a continuation of high school. In others it looks like an imitation of the first two years at the state university, which is usually the weakest section of the curriculum of that institution. Since fifty percent of its students leave it every year, the junior college has difficulty in constructing a coherent program. It is, therefore, ambiguous in aim and unsatisfactory in organization.[1]

Hutchins was no more flattering of junior colleges when he stated:

> With notable exceptions the junior college has so far done only a negative job. It has kept young people from going places and doing things that would have been worse for them. It has supplied an institution where they could pass the time in relatively harmless pursuits until they could go to work. When boys and girls cannot get jobs and cannot afford to go away to college, the junior college is indispensable.[2]

Perhaps another reason why community-junior college national spokesmen felt some friendship for the ideas of Hutchins is that despite his belief in general education for intellectual development, he was forced at times to admit that there could not be a single junior college curriculum for all students. He sounded practical and conventional in 1934 when he told the National Education Association that students between the ages of sixteen and twenty should pursue one of two courses of study--one cultural and the other technical. At age twenty, then said Hutchins, a student should go to work unless interested and qualified in some scholarly and professional field.[1]

---

[1] Robert M. Hutchins, No Friendly Voice (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 109.

[2] Robert M. Hutchins, "The Junior College," Educational Record, XIX (January, 1938), 5.

Hutchins seldom mentioned such dual-track curricula in his writings, but he was willing to accept curricular divisions if indeed all parts were directed to the same end. He was concerned that the "terminal" and "semi-professional" education of which junior college leaders spoke was actually aimed at specific rather than general education, and he made these concerns explicit at the 1941 AAJC Convention. "The best terminal education," Hutchins told the delegates, "is general education." And general education, Hutchins explained, meant learning the great ideas of the human experience--not "finger-waiving or flying." If a student is to understand human tradition, Hutchins went on,:

> . . . he is going to have to read and read important books. But if anybody can suggest a better method of accomplishing the purpose, I shall gladly embrace him and it.[2]

The non-readers presented a special problem to Hutchins, but he believed some way could be devised to give to them, too, a satisfactory general--which to Hutchins meant intellectual--education.[3]

Hutchins was sensitive to the problem that faced junior college educators in convincing the students with university aspirations but with limited intelligence to become terminal students. Unlike most other university educators, Hutchins was willing to grant the bachelor's degree, as Wood proposed, at the end of a student's sophomore year. Supporting the type of 6-4-4 plan that interested many junior college leaders, Hutchins stated:

---

[1] Robert M. Hutchins, "Turn High Schools into People Colleges," NEA Journal, XXIII (November, 1934), 217.

[2] Robert M. Hutchins, "The Junior College and Terminal Education," Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 551.

[3] Ibid., p. 554.

> This reorganization cannot be as successful as it should be unless students who should leave at the end of junior college can be induced to do so. I do not believe that they can be induced to do so unless some recognizable and popular insignia can be conferred upon them at that stage. The bachelor's degree meets those requirements; and since it serves no useful purpose at present it may well be devoted to the useful purpose of assisting out of education those who should no longer remain in it.[1]

Hutchins tried to implement his ideas at the University of Chicago. The distinctions between the Junior Colleges and the Senior Colleges at that institution that Harper had tried to make at the beginning of the century had almost completely disappeared in a complicated network of departmental regulations by 1929. In 1930, the University faculty, led by Hutchins, made a bold effort to return to a simpler, more efficient organization which certainly would have pleased Harper. Abolishing the old super-structure altogether, which had grown to seventy-two independent units, only five administrative divisions were established--the Biological Sciences, the Physical Sciences, the Social Sciences, the Humanities, and the College. The College was to do all of the general education, and the adademic divisions were to conduct advanced study and research and to grant all degrees.[2] Hutchins found, as did Harper, that his grand and simple plan was compromised and complicated by departmental realities. The College drew its teachers from the academic divisions, and their loyalty to advanced study and research thwarted the aims of the College.

---

[1] Hutchins, "The Junior College," pp. 10-11.

[2] Hutchins, No Friendly Voice, p. 190.

It was not until 1942 that Hutchins convinced exactly half of the faculty, allowing him to cast the deciding vote in its favor, to allow the College to employ its own faculty and to grant the bachelor's degree at the end of the sophomore year (the College did offer a four-year program, beginning in 1933, by accepting sophomore high school students and providing them with a course of study from grade eleven through grade fourteen). But Hutchins was no more successful than Harper in providing a model that other universities would imitate; and he was no more successful than Harper in maintaining enthusiasm for the experiment among his own faculty. Hutchins left a divided and generally demoralized faculty as well as a faltering undergraduate program at Chicago when he resigned from the presidency in 1951. Convinced that colleges and universities could not regenerate themselves in an apathetic or hostile social environment, Hutchins assisted in founding the Fund for the Republic in hopes that direct involvement in analyzing and solving basic social problems would be the most effective use of his ideas.[1]

Five of the community-junior college national spokesmen included in this study began publishing articles late in the 1930's. Since they became major figures in the community-junior college field in a later period, only a brief introduction of them will be given here. B. Lamar Johnson was Dean of Instruction and Librarian at Stephens College when he began his campaign to strengthen general education in the nation's junior colleges, thus carrying on the work and most of the ideas of James M. Wood. Speaking in familiar terms of meeting individual needs and making education closer to life, Johnson paid special attention to the matter of guidance. "Uniformly," stated Johnson, "colleges committed to general education stress guidance":

---

[1] Harris, Five Counterrevolutionaries, p. 136.

> This is reasonable, for, if general education aims to help the individual adjust to life, it is essential to recognize that this adjustment is an individual matter--dependent upon individual abilities, interests, and needs.[1]

Johnson was one of the eight members of the National Society for the Study of Education's Committee on General Education in 1939, and he contributed an article for its thirty-eighth yearbook describing the general education programs at various colleges, including Stephens and Pasadena Junior College.[2]

C. C. Colvert began his career in junior college work as the Dean of Central College in Arkansas, where Doak S. Campbell was president. In 1931 he became president of a junior college in Monroe, Louisiana, and in that position was able to complete a Ph.D. at George Peabody in 1937. Colvert's doctoral dissertation, written with the help of Campbell, was largely a follow-up on Campbell's 1930 study of junior college purposes. Its strongest theme was a criticism of the few terminal curricula in junior colleges even though terminal education ranked high in the stated purposes of junior colleges. Colvert's four recommendations at the conclusion of his study began with the need for more terminal curricula:

> (1) the junior college should place more emphasis on vocational, terminal, and semi-professional courses; (2) general education for the youth of junior college age should be stressed as a unifying agency in the development of citizenship and cultural background; (3) the junior college should develop its curriculum to include the education of the adults in the community; and (4) the accrediting agencies should permit the junior college to construct its curricula so that the needs of youth

---

[1] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education Changes and the College," Journal of Higher Education, IX (January, 1938), pp. 21-22.

[2] B. Lamar Johnson, "The Junior College," in General Education in the American College, Thirty-eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1939), pp. 113-134.

> and others in the service area of the institution may be best served in keeping with the objectives of the institution under consideration.[1]

Leland L. Medsker and James W. Reynolds both wrote in the late 1930's about building junior college curricula upon the advice of industrial leaders. Medsker, a department chairman at Wright Junior College in Chicago from 1936 to 1938 and Assistant Director of the Bureau of Occupational Research and Guidance for the Chicago public schools from 1938 to 1946, spent considerable time going to local industries to find out the level and type of jobs industrialists desired junior colleges to train young people to fill. He recommended that other junior colleges do the same.[2] Reynolds, Dean of Fort Smith Junior College in Arkansas, was once greeted with a round of laughter at a teacher's meeting when he suggested that community businessmen should be invited to help plan courses. He countered the challenge: "Who knows better than the employer what skills and knowledge an employee should have?"[3] Reynolds lamented the attitude of the populace of Fort Smith toward their junior college, which he gauged to range from "apathy to hostility." It had the reputation of a charity school for those who could not afford to go elsewhere, observed Reynolds, yet he argued that public support and understanding would greet the development of terminal education. The community would get workers from its investment, Reynolds maintained, who would stay in the community and contribute to its economy.[4]

---

[1] Clyde C. Colvert, The Public Junior College Curriculum, Louisiana State University Studies, No. 38 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1939).

[2] Leland L. Medsker, "Chicago Faces the Issue on Terminal Courses," Junior College Journal, IX (December, 1938), 109-111.

[3] James W. Reynolds, "The Junior College and Industrial Education," Industrial Education Magazine, XLI (November, 1939), 236.

[4] James W. Reynolds, "Community Relations," Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 529-531.

Jesse P. Bogue, later to serve as Executive Secretary of AAJC from 1946 to 1958, was president of Green Mountain Junior College in Poultney, Vermont, from 1931 to 1946. Bogue had been a Methodist minister for the decade after World War One, and his message to junior colleges was to build in students a type of Christian fellowship which would insure a harmonious society. This could be done, maintained Bogue, through proper general education. Bogue was concerned that the distress and suffering of people during the depression might cause some to doubt the efficacy of continuing technological development. He argued that a higher technology and a higher development of man's attitudes would combine to produce a society much better than could be achieved by returning to the plow.[1]

The preceding introduction to the careers and ideas of the community-junior college national spokesmen during the 1920's and 1930's contains evidence enough that they were generally united in their campaign to expand the terminal curricula in the colleges. Their view of the needs of American society and the needs of less intelligent youth led them to believe that the junior college could play a key role in developing an efficient, productive society in which all would be satisfied with their life and competent in their work. Such an ideology produced a unity and a missionary zeal that in part may explain the mushrooming growth of junior colleges during these years, even during the depths of depression. Its importance justifies further analysis.

The Meaning of Junior College Terminal Education

No topic received greater attention and more agreement among the community-junior college national spokesmen during the 1920's and 1930's than the importance of terminal education in the junior college. As mentioned earlier, junior college leaders generally referred to the dual nature of terminal education: a vocational aspect, to prepare students for jobs, and a general education aspect, to prepare students for good citizenship, often called "social intelligence." In a 1940 national study on terminal education in junior colleges, Eells used two definitions of terminal curricula. One was a short, general definition that was included in the questionnaire to junior colleges which defined terminal curricula as those "primarily designed to prepare students for occupations and activities of life."[1] The other, used in reporting the terminal offerings, was more detailed:

---

[1] Jesse P. Bogue, "The Junior College in American Education," Junior College Journal, X (October, 1939), 65-69.

> "Terminal curricula" are designed for students who wish in one or two years to gain an understanding of their intellectual, social, and civic environments, to explore several fields as an aid in making occupational choice, or to acquire vocational training which will lead to employment in semiprofessional fields. Thus terminal curricula may be of the general or cultural type, of the vocational or semiprofessional type, or a combination of the two. Terminal programs are not intended to prepare students for transfer to four-year colleges or universities, although some graduates may actually enter such institutions.[2]

Eells' definition permitted terminal education to be conceived as a two-track educational program, one track for jobs and the other for life, or as a single program blending vocational and life-adjustment aspects. Surprisingly, this curricular option did not cause any debate among the many advocates of more terminal curricula in junior colleges.

The looseness in the definition of terminal education, which seemed to go unnoticed in most writings on the subject, did not prevent the term from becoming the rallying symbol for junior college leaders. Koos did a study of the opinions of secondary school leaders concerning the basic goals of secondary schools, and the only unanimous agreement detected was on the teaching of social-civic responsibility and occupational efficiency. Koos noted that this coincided exactly with the terminal education function of junior colleges.[1] Eells became concerned that the meaning of the terms "vocational" and "occupational" might distort the proper view that junior colleges should train people for jobs above the trades but below the professions. He urged junior college leaders to use the term "semi-professional" to indicate more precisely the type of curricula appropriate to junior colleges, and many of them did.[2]

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education, Terminal Education Monograph No. @ (Washington, D.C.: AAJC, 1941), 253.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

Although community-junior college national spokesmen continued to make verbal distinctions between social-civic and vocational aspects of terminal education, they did not really think that there was any basic difference between training a student to be a good citizen and training him to be a good worker. Attempts to suggest specific curricula differentiating the two aspects usually ended in confusion, or a retreat to generalities. A state survey in California, for instance, began an investigation of junior college general education by establishing separate committees for the study of terminal general education and for the study of terminal vocational education. The two committees, however, discovered that they were studying virtually the same thing and merged into one.[3]

---

[1] Leonard V. Koos, Trends in American Secondary Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926), p. 9.

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, "Vocational or Semi-Professional?," Junior College Journal, IX (November, 1938), 61-62.

[3] Eells, Why Junior College Terminal Education, pp. ix-x.

The unity among junior college leaders provided by the concept of terminal education did not break down because their unifying ideology was centered upon the ends of terminal education and not the means. The vision of an orderly, efficient, structured, harmonious, industrial society which they shared was clear enough that the blurred focus upon means could be tolerated as a temporary problem. When terminal education was defined in outcomes rather than inputs, it seemed precise enough. None of the community-junior college national leaders during this era would have disagreed with Ricciardi's definition of a terminal course:

> A terminal course is one which makes the individual who successfully completes it socially more efficient, more intelligent as a citizen and occupationally competent in a nonprofessional or semiprofessional occupation.[1]

Although community-junior college national leaders themselves concentrated on the why of junior college terminal education more than the how of it, they did not go easy on the failure of junior colleges to provide enough terminal curricula. The major studies on junior colleges by McDowell in 1917, Koos in 1921, Campbell in 1930, Eells in 1931, and Colvert in 1937 all charged that junior colleges were concentrating too much on the preparatory function and neglecting the terminal function.[2] Despite the interval of twenty years between the study of McDowell and that of Colvert, during which time the need for more terminal curricula was increasingly publicized by community-junior college national leaders, Colvert found that the ratio between nonacademic (terminal) courses and academic (preparatory or university transfer) courses had remained significantly unchanged in the curricula of public junior colleges.[1] There was uniform regret that junior colleges had yet to live up to their potential for providing terminal education, the type of education that the community-junior college national spokesmen were convinced needed to be developed to strengthen American society. All the same, however, there was a dearth of suggestions from them on the precise nature of such terminal curricula.

---

[1] Nicholas Ricciardi, The Need for Terminal Courses in the Junior College, California Department of Education Bulletin No. C-6 (Sacramento: Government State Printing Office, 1928), p. 3.

[2] McDowell, The Junior College, p. 52; Koos, The Junior College Movement, p. 33; Campbell, A Critical Study, p. 83; Eells, The Junior College, pp. 520-529; Colvert, The Public Junior College Curriculum, p. 140.

The Emphasis Upon Social Intelligence

While the community-junior college national spokesmen during this era purported to divide the concept of terminal education into two separate and equal parts--semiprofessional training and social-civic training--they actually placed their major emphasis on the later goal. It was possible for them to discuss citizenship training without mentioning jobs, but they seldom discussed job skills without underscoring the importance of character attributes. Eells' suggestion that junior college leaders employ the term "semiprofessional" rather than "occupational" or "vocational" for their programs was made in part to emphasize that the semiprofessions, like the professions they approximated, involved more than a skill. In addition, said Eells, the programs must contain enough "cultural education" to produce "a fit man of his own professional group and of the society of which it is a part."[2] When Nicholas Ricciardi addressed delegates of AAJC in 1928 as an expert from California in vocational education, he delivered two anecdotes which conveyed the importance he placed on character building in vocational education. In one story, the manager of a large manufacturing plant was asked how much he paid his remarkably competent secretary. The reply, complete with moral, was "I pay him $1,000 a year for what he knows and $2,000 a year more for what he is." The attribute of knowledge was what Ricciardi labeled in this instance "social understanding," although in other writings he used the more common label of "social intelligence." To further emphasize the importance of "social understanding" in a good vocational education, Ricciardi went on to a second anecdote in which the moral was stated this time by a man identified only as a "prominent businessman":

---

[1] Colvert, The Public Junior College Curriculum, p. 141. Colvert determined from Koos' study that the ratio was 1:2.20 in 1921 and from Eells' study that it was 1:2.01 in 1931. In 1937, Colvert himself determined that the ratio was 1:1.82.

[2] Eells, "Vocational or Semi-Professional?," p. 62.

> "We need young workers of character. If they don't know enough about their work, we can help them to make up that deficiency on the job; but if they are lacking in character we can do very little with them."[1]

Quoting Dr. John M. Brewer of the Bureau of Vocational Guidance at Harvard University, Ricciardi drove home the moral of his anecdotes with the statistical information that two-thirds of workers fired lose their jobs because of social inadequacies rather than lack of ability to do the job.[2]

The term most often used to identify this trait of character which was as important to the worker as job skill was "social intelligence," although "social understanding" and "social effectiveness" were commonly used synonyms. It was used by community-junior college national spokesmen in the 1920's and 1930's much as Harper, Jordan, and Lange used the term "efficiency" in earlier decades. It referred to a set of personal habits, attitudes, beliefs and morals which were thought to guide men on the path of personal happiness, hard work, and loyal citizenship. The advocates of "social intelligence" seldom felt the need to define the term; it was a part of their ideology and not subject to scrutiny.

---

[1] Nicholas Ricciardi, "Discussion of Terminal Courses in California Junior Colleges," Proceedings of the Eighth Annual AAJC Meeting (Chicago, 1928), pp. 57-58.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

The term "social intelligence" was used by some educators in the Progressive Education movement, such as Alexander Meiklejohn and Malcolm MacLean,[1] to mean a type of thinking that would allow citizens alertly to question and analyze social issues and governmental policies, leading to a reformed and revitalized society. It was considered in this sense a necessary attribute to develop in all men. The way it was used by most community-junior college national spokesmen, however, was to mean a type of thinking that would lead citizens in the rank and file to accept their place in society and be loyal to the government. The distinction was of course not absolute; Meiklejohn, for instance, upon occasion expressed a fear of mob action and advocated the development of "social intelligence" as a conservative safeguard;[2] and community-junior college national leaders upon occasion expressed the cleansing effect "social intelligence" could have upon the selection of governmental leaders. In the main, however, the junior college writers viewed "social intelligence" as insurance for the preservation of an orderly society rather than stimulation for the reformation of society.[3]

---

[1] Alexander Meiklejohn, The Experimental College (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932), pp. 167-168; Malcolm S. MacLean, "The General College: The University of Minnesota," in General Education: Its Nature, Scope, and Essential Elements, ed. by William S. Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), pp. 119-131. The original name of Minnesota's General College, incidentally, was "The Institute for Social Intelligence."

[2] Meiklejohn, The Experimental College, pp. 168.

[3] In a speech at Arkansas State College in 1934, Doak S. Campbell remarked: "Education is the strongest and cheapest social insurance that can be employed, and the nation that neglects it is inviting disaster." Quoted in Fawcett, "Doak S. Campbell," pp. 125-126. Eells referred to the

The idea of the junior college concentrating upon building social intelligence in its terminal students was strengthened by a 1932 report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.[1] A study of public higher education in California was undertaken by the Foundation after the state legislature, stalled by a debate over the desirability of transforming junior colleges and state teachers colleges into four-year liberal arts colleges, authorized the governor to seek the services of an educational research foundation.[2] The Carnegie Foundation was anxious to do the study, according to its president, Dr. Henry Suzzallo, because of its potential national impact.[3] An independent Commission of Seven university men[4] was established to receive all special and staff reports and to make specific recommendations. Koos, a good friend and colleague of Suzzallo, Coffman, and Judd, submitted considerable information to the Commission.[5]

---

junior college as "the greatest safeguard and insurance for the future of American democracy" in "The Junior College and the Youth Problem," Kadelpian Review, XV (November, 1935), 13. The literature is replete with statements linking the junior college, social intelligence, and social insurance together.

[1] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, State Higher Education in California (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1932).

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, "State Higher Education in California," Junior College Journal, III (October, 1932), 30.

[3] Cited by Eells, Ibid.

[4] Members of the Commission of Seven were: Samuel P. Capen, chancelor of the University of Buffalo, chairman; Lotus D. Coffman, president of the University of Minnesota; Charles H. Judd, dean of the School of Education, University of Chicago; Orval R. Latham, president of Iowa State Teachers College; Albert B. Meredith, professor of education at New York University; James E. Russell, dean emeritus of Teachers College, Columbia University, and George F. Zook, president of the University of Akron.

[5] Conger, "Leonard V. Koos," pp. 75-78; Leonard V. Koos, "Progress and Problems of Secondary Education in California," School Life, XV (January, 1929), 81-83. The later reference is to a 1927-1928 survey that Koos did in California with an appropriation from the state legislature and a grant from the General Education Board; it was a basic document for the Carnegie study.

Of the forty-seven recommendations made by the Commission of Seven for higher education in California, over half pertained to junior colleges. The Commission was emphatic that the junior colleges remain a part of the secondary school system, offering only two years of college instruction, and granting an associate of arts degree rather than a bachelor's degree. More terminal curricula, bolstered by better counseling and guidance, was supported by several of the recommendations. The Commission singled out one curriculum as fundamental in junior college education--a Curriculum for Social Intelligence--and made this brief statement about it:

> A curriculum devised to give the student about to complete his general education a unitary conception of our developing civilization. This curriculum should be provided in all institutions offering education on a junior college level. It should be the most important curriculum, inasmuch as it aims to train for social citizenship in American civilization. . . . The courses will tend to organize knowledge and intelligence for effective social behavior rather than for the intense and detailed mastery required for professional or avocational scholarship.[1]

Junior college leaders praised the Commission of Seven's report. John W. Harbeson, for one, wrote:

> The Commission very correctly observes that the extensive enrollment of junior college students in university preparatory courses betrays the largest single functional failure of the junior college system in California.[2]

The university leaders represented on the Commission of Seven and the leaders of junior colleges were perfectly agreed that the primary focus of junior colleges should be on terminal education, and that training for social intelligence was the basic goal of terminal education.

---

[1] Carnegie Foundation, State Higher Education in California, p. 36.

[2] John W. Harbeson, "State Higher Education in California," Junior College Journal, III (October, 1932), 43. For indications of the support from other leaders see Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 115, and Eells, "State Higher Education in California," p. 31.

John W. Harbeson, who was proud of the record of Pasadena Junior College in guiding a majority of their students into terminal programs, suggested to fellow educators that training students for initiative might not contribute favorably to social intelligence. A little bit of initiative was all right, stated Harbeson, but it should not be developed as a "general tendency." Quoting Thorndike, Harbeson warned: "To cultivate general diffuse initiative would be to become a busybody." Later he added, "Independence consists in choosing whom to follow rather than in following one's own devices." Better than initiative, Harbeson advised the development in students of a "wholesome respect for authority."[1]

A curriculum for social intelligence was often recommended by businessmen as the best type of vocational education. Nicholas Ricciardi reported to the AAJC convention in 1937 the results of a poll taken among 124 members of service clubs, men "successful in different walks of life." Attributing 75 percent of their own success to their own "social understanding," they recommended that junior colleges build a curriculum to teach prospective employees social aptitudes such as dependability, co-operation. thoroughness, loyalty, etc. This was the curricular path they recommended for building "good and efficient men."[2] A curriculum for social intelligence was generally assumed to have something to do with general education, a topic upon which community-junior college national spokesmen also had much to say.

---

[1] John W. Harbeson, "Educating for Initiative," NEA Journal, XV (November, 1926), p. 260.

[2] Nicholas Ricciardi, "Curriculum-Building Meets Expanding Needs," Junior College Journal, VII (May, 1937), 446.

General Education: The Curriculum for "Social Intelligence"

In The Search for a Common Learning, Russell Thomas discussed three structures of general education, each built upon different principles. In one general education program, according to Thomas, the basic assumption is that all knowledge is essentially one and the basic curriculum is a study of the great ideas of mankind. Such a curriculum would be recommended by its advocates for all students--everyone would profit from the search through all of man's collected knowledge for the common truth. A second type of general education program that Thomas described is built upon the theory that knowledge proceeds from problem-solving and thus the curriculum centers on the study of a problem or problems, drawing information from the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the arts as it appears relevant to the problem under study. Thomas classified as a third type of general education an approach that sees meaningful knowledge resulting only from the extent to which it functions in the daily activities of man. With this view of knowledge, the curriculum would vary according to the activities of individuals.[1]

Most of the community-junior college national spokesmen discussed in this chapter viewed general education in terms of the third type described by Thomas. They were not so consistent, however, that they would always avoid mixing the three types of general education together, sometimes coming up with strange amalgamations of ideas. And there were a few, such as Hutchins and Wood, who were fairly consistent advocates of one of the other types of general education. Overall, however, the leaders sought to build a curriculum which would develop the functional commodity of social intelligence--not for all men, but for a class of men whose daily activities would involve a certain type of work and a certain level of life.

---

[1] Thomas, The Search for a Common Learning, pp. 101-103.

In fairness it must be said that the community-junior college spokesmen were not altogether clear in their own minds whether general education should be provided for all students, as the capstone of secondary education, or only for those terminating their education at the junior college level. But at the same time they were not generally concerned with altering the education of students transferring on to the university and could assume that their general education needs were being met in the traditional curriculum. They were mainly concerned with terminal students, and their attempts to build a suitable general education curriculum for them resulted in their speaking of general education as if it were applicable only to one particular class in society. Aldridge noted in his study of junior college leaders that they "emphasized, over and over again, the need for general education for everyone. But, in reality, general education became a pejorative term for watered-down courses designed for those students who did not plan to continue their education."[1] To this it should be added that general education was also proposed for students who did plan to continue their education but who were not considered suitable material for more education.

The usual type of general education curriculum advocated by community-junior college national leaders was one based on "orientation" courses, but they were seldom specific about content since they were agreed it should be designed to fit the individual. Orientation courses could in fact be used in all three models of general education advanced by Thomas. Columbia University had pioneered with an orientation course in Contemporary

---

[1] Aldridge, "A Comparative Study," p. 264.

Civilization in 1919, followed by an orientation course in humanities at Reed College in 1921 and one titled "The Nature of the World and Man" at the University of Chicago in 1924.[1] The idea behind the orientation courses at Columbia, Reed, and Chicago was to develop in students an awareness of the organic unity of various branches of knowledge and the organic relationships binding all men, but the idea behind the orientation courses proposed by junior college leaders, generally speaking, was to develop the type of social intelligence which they thought was needed by terminal students. Harbeson used the orientation course model at Pasadena and thought it contributed to building in terminal students an "integrated personality." As close as Harbeson came to describing an integrated personality, however, was to state that it allowed the individual to function effectively in work and in life. Pasadena Junior College offered orientation courses in science, humanities, social studies, the American family, and one called "General Orientation," but Harbeson argued that general education did not embody any specific group of subjects.[2] It might be possible, maintained Harbeson, to build a curriculum of general education exclusively around the student's vocational interests.[3]

James M. Wood and B. Lamar Johnson both recommended the orientation model of general education which they practiced at Stephens College to other junior colleges. Although Wood insisted that "general education should be the heritage of all the boys and girls who live in America," he also maintained that it should be student-centered, adapted differently for various types of students.[1] Concerned that junior college leaders were devising programs of general education for terminal students only, Wood in a 1940 speech before AAJC stressed that it should be provided for all. Recognizing the problem in transferring credit for non-traditional courses to the university, however, Wood added that "the interests of the students who will enter upper-division courses should, of course, be safeguarded."[2] Johnson wrote how new evaluation procedures at Stephens reinforced the goals of general education. Instructors graded each student on traits such as: shows awareness of broader relations of course materials; works without undue supervision; has original ideas and acts independently; and enthusiastic and interested in the course. Advisers, residence-hall counselors, and others knowing the student out of class graded him on other criteria: enters into the social life of the school; considers and appreciates the rights of others; follows a desirable plan of time allotment; creates a favorable impression, etc.[3] It was characteristic for junior college leaders to consider general education in terms of resulting behavior more than in terms of knowledge content.

---

[1] Thomas, The Search for a Common Learning, p. 69.

[2] John W. Harbeson, "General Curricula," Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 594; and Harbeson, "Vocational Completion Courses," pp. 434-435.

[3] Harbeson, "General Curricula," p. 595.

Doak S. Campbell spoke to AAJC conventioners in 1933 about the need for junior colleges to develop general education curricula around functional behavior rather than abstract ideas. Campbell was not exactly sure how this could be done or what the curricular product would be, but he spoke in general terms about "functional centers of social interest" which he thought could be derived from "major social purposes." He gave only this one example of a center of social interest that might be functionally studied in the curriculum:

---

[1] James M. Wood, "Twenty Years' Progress," Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 514.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 516.

[3] B. Lamar Johnson, "Strengths and Weaknesses of General Education," Journal of Higher Education, IX (February, 1938), 75-76.

> . . . protecting life and property may be a good center of interest. But this does not indicate what direction shall be taken; that is, what understandings, attitudes, appreciations, and automatic responses should be developed in connection with this function of protection. Should a man steal if he can get away with it? Should one kill in protecting property? The answers to such questions which develop from centers of interest must be dictated by the aims of education.[1]

Campbell did not go on to explain the "aims of education" which would dictate the answers to questions about functional "understandings, attitudes, appreciation, and automatic responses," but his usual explanation of aims and purposes were stated in generalities about good living, efficient working, and patriotic citizenship which dictated little at all of a specific, functional nature. As difficult as identifying specific curricular components of terminal general education was for Campbell and other junior college spokesmen, they had no difficulty accepting the general idea of a terminal curriculum somehow designed to promote the proper development of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors which they thought of as "social intelligence."

The emphasis upon functional learning and behavior in programs of terminal general education in the writings of the community-junior college national spokesmen was based upon their ideas of the needs of society rather than upon their ideas of learning. Nicholas Ricciardi sounds quite Skinnerian when he states:

> The materials selected for curriculum building should be as to help the instructors to state specifically the chief outcomes they plan to achieve in terms of skill, technical

---

[1] Doak S. Campbell, "The Junior College Curriculum," Junior College Journal, III (May, 1933), 418.

> knowledge, or social understanding which serves to modify the behavior of the learner.[1]

But Ricciardi goes on in the same paragraph to illustrate that the behavior that he advocates detailing is essentially moral behavior, acting as a good Christian, a good citizen, and a good worker. Ricciardi's story of an efficient locksmith using his skill either to repair locks or to pick them, which was quoted earlier, was used as an example of the type of behavior that should be subject to modification. Ricciardi, like Campbell, did not offer any specific listing of behaviors that would constitute a good program of general education. He did not, however, shield this shortcoming with the justification that general education would have to be different for each individual. He thought that agreement would be reached on an education for the common life:

> An education for the common life, with a core of material for all, but adapted to the varying abilities and aptitudes of youth, should be the basis for the formal educational program. . . . The effective application of this principle requires, of course, agreement on what is the common life. When we have reached such agreement, it should not be very difficult to find a core of common materials for all, but adapted to the varying abilities and aptitudes of youth.[2]

Ricciardi went on to explain that the common life "includes all of the activities which are intended to give a person satisfaction and to make him socially useful."[3]

Talking in generalities and cliches about terminal education, social intelligence, and general education was commonplace in the writings of the community-junior college national spokesmen. But they did not really need to be any more specific in conveying an ideology of an orderly, efficient, structured society; in fact, generalities and vague statements can be helpful in an ideology to avoid confrontation with real and difficult issues. Junior college spokesmen were heralding the junior college as a democratizing agent in American society and they were also advocating greater efforts to steer the masses into appropriate slots in a heirarchical structure necessitated by an industrial economy. It is little wonder that confusions and contradictions existed in their promotional rhetoric, glossed over by frequent use of accepted and idealized generalities.

---

[1] Ricciardi, "Vocational Curricula," p. 598.

[2] Nicholas Ricciardi, "Education for the Common Life," Junior College Journal, VIII (January, 1938), 163.

[3] *Ibid.*

Vocational Curricula

Although the community-junior college national spokesmen heavily emphasized general education and social intelligence, they did not neglect to direct their attention now and then to the other aspect of terminal education--vocational education. Confusing the supposed dualism between vocational and general education was the fact that it could be argued that the best vocational education was training for social intelligence through general education. But none of the persons in this study actually went to that extreme, which would have destroyed the assumed dualism. They clung to the idea that vocational education was somehow a distinct part of terminal education.

Most of the community-junior college national spokesmen accepted Eells' advice to clarify their support for vocational education in the junior college by specifying "semi-professional" training, as distinguished from lower level trade training.[1] They were accepting of the idea that the vocational aim of junior colleges should be somewhere between the professions and the trades, but they were strikingly naive about the types of jobs and the types of training falling in that domain. L. W. Smith concluded a speech to AAJC convention delegates in 1928 with this attempt, one of the few, to pinpoint the essential difference between semiprofessional vocational education and other types of vocational and professional education:

---

[1] Eells, "Vocational or Semi-Professional?," pp. 61-62.

> More than all, however, it is necessary to set up a series of courses which have been designated as terminal in character. Various phrases have been used to describe the content of these courses. One name with reference to them has been that these courses are semi-professional. It is certain that these courses must be above the level of routine and handicraft vocational courses that are given in high school. These students will undoubtedly enter vocations that have a great deal of routine work in them. This routine, however, will be above the manipulative level. Perhaps it can be said that the thing that will characterize the semi-professional courses will be that they will prepare students to live on the level of intellectual routine rather than manipulative routine. Junior engineers in architects' and engineers' offices will be examples. The nursing profession is another. People who enter these vocational fields will be the masters of certain definite bodies of technique and will be expected to use intelligence of a rather high order in their work. They are distinctly below the highly professional specialization that takes place on the university level.[1]

It was also characteristic of Smith's colleagues in the community-junior college movement to match, at least at a theoretical level, levels of individual intelligence with levels of vocational competence.

Koos made an uncommon effort to determine what vocational positions could be labeled semiprofessional. His method was to go through the catalogues of various universities to see if any of their programs in the professional area lacked the specialization requiring over two years of study; he found nineteen such programs, mostly in pre-engineering and commerce, and recommended them to junior college leaders.[2] The type of vocational training that junior colleges were actually doing, according to surveys by Eells and Colvert,[1] was not easily labeled semiprofessional. There were some curricula for agriculture, secretarial training, automechanics, drafting, and welding, for example, which were quite similar to high school programs. And there were other curricula for accounting, architecture, various types of engineering, and social service, as other examples, which came close to programs offered at the university level. Of course it could be argued, and was, that junior college terminal students in programs which overlapped with high school programs would probably become foremen and supervisors in those occupations, and that those in programs overlapping with university programs would probably be assistants and technicians in those professions. But these arguments were advanced as logical results of intermediate education between high school and the university; seldom were they based on any specific curricular or occupational criteria.

---

[1] L. W. Smith, "Junior College Objectives," Proceedings of the Ninth Annual AAJC Meeting (Fort Worth, 1928), p. 88.

[2] Koos, "The Junior College Curriculum," p. 662.

There were some efforts later in the 1930's, as previously noted in the discussion of Medsker and Reynolds, to go directly to factory managers and to ask them what training the junior college should give students to qualify them for employment. Earlier solicitations of educational ideas from business leaders, such as the one carried out by Ricciardi, generally emphasized the importance of building sound character and social intelligence. Solicitation from particular industries, however, began to yield an interest in developing specific marketable skills. This approach was successful in urban areas where large industries needing specially trained workers were located. Medsker in Chicago and Harbeson in the Los Angeles area were able to establish liaisons with such large industries.[1]

---

[1] Eells, Present Status of Terminal Education; Colvert, The Public Junior College Curriculum.

Harbeson's experience with the aircraft industry is particularly illuminating. Pasadena Junior College had developed a semiprofessional curriculum in aviation technology in 1931, blending general education with some rather general introductory courses in aeronautics, aircraft design, machines, etc. Some optional courses were permitted and overall the program was not far from the 40-40-20 balance among general, vocational, and optional courses suggested in Eells' terminal education study.[2] The aim of the program was to produce semiprofessional workers to hold supervisory roles over factory operations and to assist professional designers and managers in the industry. Harbeson found difficulty in placing the graduates of the program, however, and went to the industry for guidance. He discovered that they wanted specific skills, and with the help of the industry the program in aviation technology was altered in 1934 to include several specializations, such as drafting, design, construction, and maintenance. The number of general education courses was cut, and the ones remaining in the program were vocationally designed. English courses, for instance, emphasized the writing of technical reports, and a course in industrial organization took the place of a general social science course. Pasadena Junior College thus responded to the needs of local industry by substituting a clearly vocational program for one abstractly designed to be semiprofessional.[3]

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker, "How Chicago Colleges are Meeting the Need." Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 456-461; John W. Harbeson, "Aviation Technology at Pasadena," Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 482-485.

[2] Eells, Why Junior College Terminal Education?, p. 10.

[3] Harbeson, "Aviation Technology," p. 485.

The work of Medsker and Harbeson, however, was not characteristic of junior college leaders during this period. Even in the high schools, where the same status need did not exist to offer programs above the common level of trade training, there was tremendous concern that general or cultural education not be overshadowed by vocational training.[1] Most community-junior college national spokesmen during this period, when they spoke of vocational education, really meant semiprofessional education, even if their terminology sometimes concealed the fact. They envisioned a curriculum dominated by general education, geared for the training of social intelligence. It was vocational in that it would be appropriate to a particular vocational level in society and not in that it would train a student to run a particular machine or to perform a particular task. There were, of course, technical institutes with no reservations about vocational education being anything but training technical skills, and some of these became junior colleges and affiliated with AAJC.[2] Their philosophy of education, however, did not seem to affect the ideas of the community-junior college national spokesmen in the slightest.

Junior colleges were singularly unaffected by the big push for vocational education before World War One, spearheaded by the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, generally regarded as the culmination of the Society's efforts, provided federal funds only for vocational education "of less than a college grade," a qualifier which remained in federal vocational education legislation throughout the 1920's and 1930's.[1] It was not until 1937 that AAJC attempted, unsuccessfully, to have the George-Dean Act revised to read "of less than senior college grade."[2] Although unsuccessful in the halls of Congress during this period, Eells reported in 1941 that interpretation of legislative language by the Office of Education was allowing some junior colleges, despite their nomenclature, to receive federal funds for vocational education of less than a college grade.[3] The general failure of community-junior college national spokesmen to fight for a share in federal vocational education funds until late in the 1930's however, stands as further proof that the type of terminal education they had in mind for junior colleges was not so much vocational as it was social. They began with the idea of a certain class of people with a presumed certain level of intelligence whom they felt should be trained for a certain level of society, and their idea of general and vocational education stemmed from this view of a proper society.

---

[1] Arthur Beverly Mays, The Concept of Vocational Education in the Thinking of the General Educator, 1845 to 1945, Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin No. 62, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946), pp. 81-84.

[2] Hillway, The American Two-Year College, pp. 50-53.

Selectivity and Guidance

The Community-junior college national spokesmen of this period faced questions even more fundamental than the types of semiprofessional curricula to offer in junior colleges. They had to grapple with the questions of who were and who should be terminal students in the first place. Some assumed that the mere offering of terminal curricula would automatically attract students suitable to them, but it was soon obvious that such would not be the case. The desire of students to go on to higher levels of educational training, they found, was stronger than student realization of the curriculum appropriate to their abilities and needs. Terminal students who failed to realize that they really were terminal students, junior college leaders were agreed, needed professional guidance to help them realize what they were and where they should be going.

---

[1] Fisher, Industrial Education, pp. 130-135. A concise summary of federal vocational education legislation can be found in Grant Venn, Man, Education, and Work (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964), pp. 56-62.

[2] Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 94.

[3] Eells, The Present Status of Terminal Education, p. 29.

It will be recalled from earlier in this chapter that Koos labeled the guidance service that the junior college could offer students the democratizing function, exercising a sympathetic concern for the less inteligent rather than having them face the ruthless elimination waiting for them in universities. Koos charged that the traditional methods of university selection through elimination, "besides being undemocratic, were bunglesome and wasteful."[1] The new type of selection procedure, thought by Koos to be democratic, would be a gentle but effective guidance system, one that:

> . . . should be woven into the fabric of secondary education. For those who administer or teach in the future secondary school, attitudes of guidance should operate as subconsciously as did those of selection in the high school near the close, let us say, of the last century.[2]

Selection through guidance, argued Koos, should be a scientific process. He regretted that the debate over whether or not the high drop-out rate among ethnic groups was a result of native ability was "being answered . . . more in terms of one's commitment to, or denial of, Nordic supremacy than by resort to science."[3]

---

[1] Leonard V. Koos, Trends in American Secondary Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926), p. 46.

[2] Ibid., p. 45.

[3] Leonard V. Koos, The American Secondary School (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1927), p. 137. Koos went on to support the idea of slight differences in I.Q. among various ethnic groups by citing testing results from Gustave A. Geingold.

If a guidance program was to select and guide students properly, Koos argued that it had to attend to two phases of guidance--adjustment and distribution. The adjustment phase concerned helping the individual make an "optimal adjustment to educational and vocational situations," and the distributive phase, where Koos thought that junior colleges made a poor showing, was "to distribute youth as effectively as possible to educational and vocational opportunities."[1] Koos was confident that the scientific testing of intelligence being advanced by the followers of G. Stanley Hall, particularly Edward L. Thorndike and Lewis M. Terman, would provide the means for proper selection and proper distribution.[2]

Walter Crosby Eells also welcomed the measures of intelligence devised by Lewis M. Terman as the basic tools for guidance workers. In his textbook on the junior college, Eells referred to a statement by Terman that there were only two essential factors in any school--the raw material, or students, and the educational processes. With modern, scientific methods to determine the quality of the raw material, Eells concluded, the educational processes can be altered appropriately.[3] Eells was more aware than most of his contemporaries in the junior college movement that there would be a problem in guiding the raw material to the right processing plant:

> It is very difficult to enroll students in a curriculum upon the gates of which are inscribed the motto, "Abandon all hope of university education, ye who enter here." Many students who deserve and will profit from by a junior college education

---

[1] Leonard V. Koos, "Program of Guidance in the Junior College," Junior College Journal, II (May, 1932), 443; also see two other articles by Koos: "The Interpretation of Guidance," Junior-Senior High School Clearinghouse, VIII (September, 1933), 8; and "Some Essentials in Student Personnel Work," Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 605.

[2] Koos, The American Secondary School, pp. 120-124.

[3] Eells, The Junior College, pp. 599-600.

> may and probably should never enter the university for professional work, but they and their parents object, and properly so, to having the door of possible entrance to the university unalterably closed to them if they chose a semiprofessional curriculum, or a curriculum for social intelligence. They will refuse to submit to any such doctrine of academic predeterminism which forever forbids possible entrance to educational paradise. They will decline to be the victims of any such doctrine of educational damnation.[1]

At the time that Eells employed the imagery of Dante's Inferno in the above quotation, he was thinking of intelligence testing as an alternative to course requirements to determine who was qualified for the university.[2] He was not arguing for an open door to the university; his view that few could or should enter professional life was clearly stated in his 1931 textbook quoted earlier in this chapter. He reiterated in 1935:

> There will always be a place, of course, for the specialized training of the *minority* of high school graduates needed for positions of leadership in the professional, industrial, and political life of the country; but there will be an increasing place for the junior college, the college for the *majority* of high school graduates, fitted for other fields of usefulness in the life of the nation.[3]

By 1941 Eells realized that intelligence testing alone was not going to replace curricular requirements for university entrance nor convince students of their own abilities. Guidance would have to be the answer to both problems, and the way he described that the guidance system should work, which would become a standard procedure in most junior colleges, merits a close look.

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, "Adjustments to the Junior College Curriculum," Junior College Journal, III (May, 1933), 408.

[2] Ibid.; a similar argument was given fuller treatment by Duffus, Democracy Enters the College, pp. 89-102.

[3] Walter Crosby Eells, "The Junior College and the Youth Problem," Kadelpian Review, XV (November, 1935), 12.

In Eells' evaluative volume on the Terminal Education Survey, he mentioned that junior college administrators had complained to him often during the survey that students were resisting terminal curricula in preference, often at the urging of their parents, for the transfer programs. Eells suggested that junior colleges would do well to follow the example set by Pasadena Junior College, and he quoted extensively from a Pasadena counselor describing the guidance process:

> The feature of our guidance service that has most to do with placing students in terminal curricula is the first interview which every student has with his counselor. . . . We made it a point to grant no appointments for interviews unless a transcript of the student's previous record has been received. "No transcript--no interview." We also invite the student's parent (or parents) to come at this time, and a very large percentage of them do.
>
> . . . .
>
> One merely has to point out the "amounts" and "kinds" of intelligence necessary for success in the semiprofessions as opposed to the strictly professional fields, the recommended high school patterns of subjects involved, the quality of high school work and later college work demanded, the opportunities for employment upon graduation, the length of the courses, the costs of the different training programs, opportunity to "work one's way through school," etc.,--and then leave the final decision to the common sense of the student and parents.[1]

"Terminal curricula," advised Eells, "can be popularized in other junior colleges if intelligently interpreted to the student, to the parent, and to the community."[2]

John W. Harbeson, the Principal of Pasadena Junior College, suggested a procedure a decade earlier that also became common practice in the nation's junior colleges. The General Orientation course at Pasadena was recommended by Harbeson to other junior colleges seeking a good guidance program. The semester course spent the first several weeks doing extensive testing, using a battery of intelligence, ability, and interests tests. Most of the remainder of the course was a study of occupations, ranked according to the requirements in terms of intelligence, ability, and interests for individuals likely to be successful in them.[1] Harbeson knew his suggestion would be of interest to junior college educators since in 1928 he did a national survey on the importance of orientation courses, and he found that of the four types of courses in the survey--social sciences, humanities, natural sciences, and vocational counseling--junior college educators thought that orientation in vocational counseling was the most important for junior colleges.[2]

---

[1] Eells, Why Junior College Terminal Education?, p. 67.

[2] Ibid., p. 68.

Pasadena Junior College was also singled out by the Carnegie Commission study on higher education in California, the same study that set the training of social intelligence as the most important goal of junior colleges, for its effective guidance program. Recommendation Sixteen of the Commission report was:

> . . . that individual student counseling, which has had a wide development throughout the junior colleges, be continued and made more effectual. As guidance techniques are improved, the results of intensive personnel studies should be made more binding upon the students. The better training of counselors is commended to the university and teachers' college authorities and to the State Board of Education.[3]

Harbeson did not go as far as the Carnegie Commission in recommending that the results of personnel studies be made more binding upon students, but he was confident, as was the Pasadena counselor quoted earlier, that information properly conveyed by a professional guidance worker would lead the student to the right decision. And he was willing to make the exposure to guidance information itself compulsory:

---

[1] John W. Harbeson, "A Suggested Orientation Program for Junior Colleges," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals, XXV (March, 1929), 350-352.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 348.

[3] Carnegie Foundation, State Higher Education in California, p. 45.

> The junior college . . . must place the emphasis on the vocational aim. No pupil should be permitted to leave its walls without, first, having surveyed the various fields of life work; secondly, without having discovered his particular vocational adaptability in so far as such information can be secured through physical and mental examination, vocational tests, rating scales, vocational counseling, etc.; and thirdly, without having made a tentative definite decision upon some vocation to which he believes himself naturally adapted.[1]

Nicholas Ricciardi's interest in a curriculum based on changing student behavior extended further to his idea of guidance. If science could predict and control the behavior of things, argued Ricciardi, then it could predict and control the behavior of human beings. This was a necessity, in his view, for "living efficiently in an industrialized democratic society."[2] The job of determining the "why" and the "what" of acceptable human behavior, stated Ricciardi, was in fact being efficiently determined by various scientists and national agencies. What was needed, and what Ricciardi thought AAJC could provide, was "a national organization which will give us the 'how'--the implementation."[3] Unless a guidance system existed to determine scientifically student characteristics and needs and to encourage sensible goals, Ricciardi warned junior colleges would be unable to build suitable curricula "which fit youth efficiently for the kind of life it will be required to live."[4]

---

[1] John W. Harbeson, "The Place of the Junior College in Public Education," Educational Review, LXVII (April, 1924), 188-189.

[2] Nicholas Ricciardi, "What Should Be Expected of the Association?," Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 426.

[3] Nicholas Ricciardi, "Diagnosis and Action," Junior College Journal, IX (October, 1938), 3.

[4] Nicholas Ricciardi, "Junior College Organization," Junior College Journal, VII (May, 1937), 426.

The community-junior college national spokesmen discussed guidance mostly in terms of developing in students "appropriate" educational and vocational goals. To a lesser extent, they discussed guidance as a factor in personal development, in terms of life-adjustment and individual happiness. Of course the right job and individual happiness were not altogether separate goals, but the type of child-centered, individualistic, psychologically-oriented concerns which Cremin states dominated the progressive education movement in the 1920's and the 1930's was only a minor theme in the rhetoric of the community-junior college leaders.[1] Jesse P. Bogue, for instance, often talked about the many college failures caused by poor social adjustment rather than lack of intelligence, and he urged junior college administrators and teachers to develop warm, sympathetic relationships with students to assist their adjustment. He advised that junior college campuses should remain small enough "for the president to know every student by his first name and his nickname, to know his parents, the home from which he came, his strength and weaknesses, (and) his desires and aversions . . ."[2]

Wood and Johnson came closer than the other community-junior national spokesmen discussed in this chapter to an idea of guidance stemming from a child-centered pedagogical philosophy. Their conception of general education underscored the importance of attentive and individualized care to the personal and curricular needs of each student. Individual curricula and individual guidance seemed to go together logically; as Johnson put it: "The guidance program assumes that the individual student is the unit, the unifying center of the total educational program."[3] Still, Wood and

---

[1] Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 182.

[2] Bogue, "The Junior College in American Education," p. 68.

[3] Johnson, "General Educational Changes," p. 22.

Johnson assumed that the happy individual would be one who adjusted well to his environment, and so they were not opposed to concepts of guidance which were predicated on the idea of assessing an individual's strengths and weaknesses and helping him find a suitable place in an industrial society. They did not, for instance, follow the suggestion of George S. Counts that the schools should cast students in a new mold to promote social reform.[1] It was strictly a capitalist society into which Wood and Johnson sought to guide junior college students, a society no different from that accepted by other community-junior college leaders.

The Impact of the Depression

While many universities and colleges found their enrollments dropping during the depression, junior college enrollments, especially in public, low-tuition institutions, increased dramatically. A survey by Campbell in 1932 determined that 70 percent of all public junior colleges increased their enrollment during that year, with the average increase being near 26 percent.[2] Some of the increase it was assumed, probably correctly, came from those students who would have gone away from home to college if family finances would have permitted it. But the bulk of the increase, it was further assumed, came from youth who would have gone to work had jobs been available. It was the role played by the junior college in combatting the idleness of youth that was most dramatized by the community-junior college national spokesmen during the 1930's. Surprisingly, the existence of the depression was seldom mentioned as evidence for the value of semiprofessional training. Nor was it mentioned as a target for junior college work, that is, for the creation of educational programs aimed at easing community problems brought on by the depression. The one connection that was drawn between the depression and the junior college offered an alternative to the idleness of youth, an idleness that threatened society with crime and degeneracy.

---

[1] George S. Counts, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? (New York: John Day Co., 1932).

[2] Doak S. Campbell, "Effects of the Depression," Junior College Journal, III (April, 1933), 381.

Campbell warned junior college leaders that their pride in enrollment growth during the depression should be tempered with a concern for those students not in the junior college or on jobs, likely to fall into a life of delinquency and crime.[1] As the depression was lifting, Campbell told delegates to the 1939 AAJC convention:

> . . . the significant result of the depression, so far as the junior college is concerned, has been that the public has been made aware of the great importance of the problem of our youth of junior college age.[2]

As technology advanced, Campbell assured the delegates that the service provided by the CCC and the NYA as emergency measures would have to be continued to keep youth out of trouble, and the public schools he asserted would logically incorporate the service.[3]

C. C. Colvert's presidential address to AAJC conventioners in 1941 was admonishment to them for allowing conditions to prevail that prevented junior colleges from doing the job that the CCC and the NYA stepped in to do:

> Had not we of the junior colleges been so busy trying to offer courses which would get our graduates into the senior

---

[1] Doak S. Campbell, "Encouragement--or Great Concern?," Junior College Journal, VIII (November, 1937), 109.

[2] Doak S. Campbell, "Retrospect and Prospect," Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 442.

[3] *Ibid.*

> colleges instead of working and offering appropriate and practical courses--terminal courses--for the vast majority of the junior college students, we might have thought to ask for, and as a result of having asked, received the privilege of training these young people.[1]

Walter Crosby Eells offered six possible alternatives to the problem of what to do with the millions of high school graduates who could not find jobs and who were "not intellectually fitted nor economically able to enter the established four-year colleges and universities." They could be kept at home, but "Satan still finds some mischief for idle hands to do." They could be turned adrift, learning lessons in the curriculum of vagrancy and crime in box cars and hobo jungles. They could, as a third alternative, end up in reform schools and penitentiaries, where society would pay more to maintain them than in school. The army was a fourth alternative, but Eells warned military strength had a tendency to lead to wars. Continuing the CCC was Eells' fifth alternative to solve the youth problem, but he pointed out its high administrative and exorbitant per worker cost. The sixth alternative was of course the junior college, the best one possible from the standpoint of both "safety and cost."[2] In his speeches and articles, Eells constantly referred to a potential vagabond army of youth posing a great threat to orderly society. Youth sincerely seeking work would be easy recruits, according to Eells, for this army:

> At first, perhaps, they are honestly seeking work, but after repeated failure to find it, what is more natural than that this ragged, hungry army of youth should lapse into a vagrant

---

[1] C. C. Colvert, "Terminal Education and National Defense," Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 496.

[2] Eells, "The Junior College and the Youth Problem," p. 10.

> class, chum with degenerate associates, prey upon society, and become potential criminals.[1]

James Reynolds also emphasized the dangers of idleness:

> Idle youth . . . is not a healthy situation. To tolerate a condition contrary to nature is to court trouble. These four to six millions of boys and girls are for the most part able-bodied, energetic, ambitious youngsters. If we force them to loaf from two to three years, we by the same token force upon them great temptations to enter ways of crime, immorality, and other vices. Idle youth is a paradoxical condition, it just doesn't exist. If we close the doors to wholesome pursuits, they will turn into the back alleys of unwholesome ones.[2]

Community-junior college national spokesmen made it clear that the "youth problem" as they referred to the threat of degeneracy and disorder among youth, was not solely a depression problem, although the depression dramatized its existence. With the age of job entry advancing with the increasing industrialization of the nation, the problem of restless youth, it was argued, would become an ever growing problem for society. Eells, making a case for terminal education, noted that "cold and dispassionate statistics collected annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation," even in 1939 and 1940 when more employment was available, showed that the 18 to 19 year old age group had the highest number of arrests. Eells admitted that it could not be proven that the crimes would not have happened if the youth had been in junior colleges, but he stated that "the presumption is strong that the correlation between junior college attendance and arrests for crime is not high."[3]

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, "The Tax Supported Junior College During the Next Decade," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals, XLV (March, 1933), 153-154.

[2] Reynolds, "The Junior College and Industrial Education," P. 233.

[3] Eells, Why Junior College Terminal Education, pp. 31-33.

C. A. Bowers has written that educators during the depression who considered themselves true followers of John Dewey, and few did not, divided into two warring factions over the extent to which schools should try to reconstruct society by identifying social ills and then deliberately using the schools to correct them.[1] Whatever battles raged within the Progressive Education Association, and Bowers mentioned several, they did not seem to rouse the martial spirits of the community-junior college spokesmen in this study. These spokesmen identified really only one ill, the "youth problem," and they were agreed that the junior college should deliberately correct the problem by providing educational programs for youth. There was no hint of reconstructing society, merely preserving it.

The Lingering Dedication to Efficient Educational Reorganization

The efforts of Harper, Jordan, Lange and countless other educators at the turn of the century to restructure the American educational system for the sake of efficiency, with all of its different meanings, did not die in the succeeding generation of educators. The later efforts, however, did lose much of their zealous and crusading nature. Reorganization was not advocated in the 1920's and 1930's as the panacea for all educational ailments, but it was still recommended to cure a good number of them.

Much has already been made of the fact that Koos, Campbell, Smith, Harbeson, and Zook stressed that the junior college should be considered part of secondary education, and accordingly they were concerned about the total and efficient integration of all education between elementary and higher education. Wood and Hutchins also favored the same plan of efficient

---

[1] C. A. Bowers, The Progressive Educator and the Depression (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 4.

organization as the others, the 6-4-4 plan, and for the same reasons, but they were perfectly willing to allow the four-year junior college segment to be called a "college." They even accepted the idea that the junior college should bestow the bachelor's degree. Only one man in the group of spokesmen suggested that the junior college should be considered a part of higher education and suggested further that the developing 6-3-3-2 pattern of organization had much going for it--Walter Crosby Eells. Eells' suggestion ignited a controversy that lit up many heated discussions on the matter.[1]

Eells advanced his explosive spark at the 1930 AAJC convention, before permanently encasing it in his 1931 textbook on the junior college. Repeating Lange's earlier question of what manner of child should the junior college be, which Lange himself had answered in defense of the secondary nature of the junior college, Eells suggested that nearly all of the advantages which proponents advanced on behalf of the 6-4-4 plan could just as well be implemented in the existing 6-3-3-2 plan. There was no proof, argued Eells, in either the saltatory theory of Hall or the theory of gradual development of Thorndike that the psychological demands of adolescence were such that one form of educational organization was any better than the other. The overlapping of course content, an inefficiency often condemned by 6-4-4 advocates, Eells thought not altogether a bad thing if the material was important; and anyway he saw no reason why curriculum planners could not eliminate most of the overlapping without merging institutions. Eells even challenged the argument of economy of time, wondering if a college should not teach a student as much as possible in a set time period rather than trying to alter the time in college for each student. Before he was done, Eells had challenged every argument in support of the 6-4-4 plan.[1]

---

[1] Omitted from consideration here are Bogue, Colvert, Johnson, Medsker, and Reynolds because they actually belonged to a later generation of junior college educators. None of them were involved in the controversy during this period over the 6-4-4 plan.

After attacking the arguments in favor of the 6-4-4 plan, Eells moved to a defense of the 6-3-3-2 plan. It was simply more convenient, he said, to add a two-year program to existing high schools, something that could be easily done regardless of administrative and geographical conditions. It was good for a child, Eells went on, to change environments to some extent and make new stimulating contacts. There would be a greater chance to exert leadership in student clubs for junior college students since upperclassmen would not be there to dominate them. The junior college could help ease the transition for students destined for the university, said Eells, by providing two easy steps into higher education rather than a single traumatic one. And there was something, argued Eells, in maintaining a collegiate atmosphere; something hard enough to do in a junior college, he added, without the presence of high school students. After all, concluded Eells, the psychology of going to college means something important to the ambitious American people--and "the great American ambition is becoming the great American habit."[2]

Eells' opposition, and there was much of it, was quick to the counterattack. Wood accused Eells of satire in an open letter to Eells for the eyes of the AAJC membership; Wood was certain no thoughtful man would seriously oppose experimental efforts to breath life into secondary education. Responding to Eells' title for his speech, Wood asserted:

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, "The Junior College--What Manner of Child Shall This Be?," Junior College Journal, I (February, 1931), 311-318.

[2] Ibid., pp. 319-322.

> You ask what manner of child the junior college is to be. I am inclined to think that unless the junior college leaders and the other men in secondary-school work provide it with vital organs quite soon, it will be still-born.[1]

Koos took a stab at the upstart Eells in a review of Eells' first book on the junior college. Overall Koos thought that Eells had made a good effort to understand the junior college and provided some good information, but he criticized severely Eells' hostile attitude toward the 6-4-4 plan, charging that Eells was more attuned to higher education that secondary education.[2]

The other community-junior college national spokesmen renewed their loyalty to the idea of the 6-4-4 plan. Harbeson continued to publicize the success of Pasadena Junior College, stressing economic efficiency, higher standards for eleventh and twelfth grade students, and a high proportion of junior college terminal students due to the fact that guidance workers had four years to guide students instead of only two.[3] Zook warned junior colleges against too great an independence, reminding an AAJC audience that the former Hapsburg possessions were moved by the spirit of independence to build high tariff walls and thus sealed their own collapse. The lesson for the junior college, Zook made clear, was that its survival depended upon integrating itself with the secondary school. Small independent junior colleges, warned Zook, were outworn and uneconomical; integration with the loss of some independence was necessary for co-ordination, for the elimination of duplication, as well as for survival.[1]

---

[1] James M. Wood, "An Open Letter," Junior College Journal, I (March, 1931), 392-393.

[2] Leonard V. Koos, "Walter Crosby Eells, The Junior College," review of The Junior College, by Walter Crosby Eells, in the School Review, XXXIX (October, 1931), 627-628. Koos loyalty to secondary education was unquestionable. He turned down an offer by President Coffman at the University of Minnesota for a new appointment as Research Professor in Higher Education in 1926, stating that he wished to remain in secondary education. Had Koos accepted, he would have been the nation's first professor in higher education. Conger, "Leonard V. Koos," p. 73.

[3] John W. Harbeson, "Integration Between High School and College," Sierra Educational News, XXXII (June, 1936), 21-22; see also Harbeson, "The Experimental Program at Pasadena," pp. 352-355.

Eells did not continue the rhetorical battle, content merely to see history go his way. He had never really taken a crusading stance in support of the 6-3-3-2 plan, although those devoted to the cause of secondary education considered his call for more study of the pros and cons of reorganization proof enough of his disloyalty. He did continue to suggest quietly that the junior college movement had too much "machine-gun variety, designed to bring down all of the game in sight," and that junior colleges should be content to seek greatness in doing the work of teaching freshmen and sophomores better than it had ever been done before.[2] Eells did suggest a compromise which nobody seemed to notice (and which probably would not have suited any of his opponents other than Wood and Hutchins anyway) to make a three-level distinction among secondary, collegiate, and university or higher education.[3] Had the distinction been accepted, it is likely that the majority of spokesmen would have continued to place the junior college in the "secondary" category rather than in the "collegiate" one where Eells thought it should be.

Despite all of the tumult over the reorganization of secondary education, however, the issue was losing its vitality. Much of the rhetoric in defense of the 6-4-4 plan had the sound of uncritical loyalty rather than vibrant enthusiasm. The heart of the plan which had been formed a generation before was efficiency, but a type of efficiency losing its meaning to educators in the 1920's and 1930's. The post-World War One educators continued to repeat arguments about saving time and money and encouraging rapid efficient student growth, but they no longer argued to build a new society. In a way, they were paying respect to venerable ideas which were not dead, but dying. Almost without notice four-year junior colleges established, ten by 1940, passed out of existence. After World War Two, California four-year junior colleges at Compton, then Ventura, and finally Pasadena were reconverted to two-year institutions--none were left in that state by 1955.[1] The allegiance of junior college leaders to the idea of the four-year junior college, first broken by Eells, passed away too.

---

[1] George F. Zook, "Junior College--Dependent or Independent?," Junior College Journal, V (May, 1935), 432-436.

[2] Eells, The Junior College, p. 161; and Walter Crosby Eells, "The Junior College--Its Character and Prospects," NEA Journal, XXII (May, 1933), 158.

[3] Eells, The Junior College, p. 659.

Friends and Enemies

In the ideological campaign of community-junior college national spokesmen, they actually encountered few overt friends or enemies. Most of their problems appeared to them to be internal. The universities were both friends and foes, sometimes offering valuable support and sometimes exerting unwelcome control. Governments, too, were sometimes generous, sometimes hostile. Many friends and enemies of the community-junior college movement during the 1920's and 1930's could probably be identified in terms of general social movements or economic forces, but in this section only two external forces--one friend and one foe--with specific identities will be discussed. They were singled out by the spokesmen as targets of friendship and of scorn.

---

[1] Brick, Forum and Focus, pp. 85-86.

The enemy was a single man critical of the junior college movement, and his ideas were attacked with a defensiveness not at all characteristic of the attack upon Eells. The man was George Herbert Palmer, professor emeritus of philosophy at Harvard, who wrote two articles about the junior college movement in the Atlantic Monthly in 1927. Palmer began his first article with an observation, a very perceptive one, that the astounding growth (he used the term "torrent") in the number of junior colleges was happening without any critical discussion of the merits of these institutions. After noting the lack of criticism, Palmer advanced to provide some. America had developed a unique collegiate system, Palmer argued, which mixed together for four crucial years three distinct elements in American society--men headed for business, men headed for the professions, and a group that Palmer labeled "amateur scholars" who were "cultivated persons, caring for much besides money-making." This later group was Palmer's concern: "They are our true aristocrats, keeping our precious democracy wholesome." They lived in the common neighborhoods and talked sense to their neighbors. They were what Germany did not have and thus made the difference between democracy and totalitarianism. The junior college movement, charged Palmer, threatened to destroy this vital element in American democracy.[1]

The threat that the junior college movement posed for the "amateur scholar" was no less, in Palmer's eyes, than a threat to destroy four-year colleges altogether. If the junior college system ever becomes complete, prophesized Palmer, "our colleges would turn into professional schools and this important class of amateur scholar would disappear."[2]

---

[1] George Herbert Palmer, "The Junior College," Atlantic Monthly, April, 1927, pp. 497-499.

[2] Ibid., p. 499.

In another issue of the Atlantic Monthly a few months later, Palmer announced his retirement from the battle against the junior college, apologizing that he was too old to carry on the fight. He announced that many letters had come to him from parents of junior college students telling of harm done to their children by junior colleges. The harm was not specified, but Palmer advised parents to refuse taxation for junior colleges and to send their children away from home to college. He also announced that several of his correspondents advised him that he was taking the increase in the number of junior colleges too seriously, charging that they were "only advertisements for real-estate speculation" and that is why "they abound in the least settled parts of our country." Despite this advice, Palmer did not retire from the fight in frivolity. In a final warning to his readers, pleading with them to be suspicious of junior colleges, Palmer shifted his concern from the class of amateur scholars to the poorer classes of society:

> Mistakes here fall hardest on our poorer classes. We who are in easier circumstances should regard ourselves as trustees for them. We can inform ourselves and get the education we want elsewhere if not at home. But one of the chief hardships of the poor is that they are tied to a single spot and must take what they are told is good.[1]

The response of most community-junior national spokesmen to Palmer's charges was at first defensive, reassuring all that the traditional New England college would survive, that the amateur scholar would also survive, and that the masses--never specifying the poor--would receive good treatment in junior colleges. They later responded to Palmer's criticisms in a more offensive fashion, clothing the junior college movement in the garb of democracy--doing for all what the liberal-arts college did for only a few. Eells, shifting roles from antagonist to defender of the community-junior college ideology, made his response as a part of his junior college textbook. Eells confessed that the scholarly type admired by Palmer was in fact vanishing in the American educational system. The villain, however, was not the junior college, insisted Eells, but rather the pressure for specialization being forced down upon all colleges from the universities above. It was possible, stated Eells, that the junior college would in fact save the amateur from complete extermination, rather than hastening the process. Concluded Eells:

---

[1] George Herbert Palmer, "The Junior College Again," Atlantic Monthly, December, 1927, p. 830.

> (The junior college) offers an opportunity to multiply and magnify many fold some of the best elements of cultural education for which institutions of the New England type have so valiently stood in the past.
>
> . . . .
>
> The junior college proposes to democratize culture by diffusing it among the masses.[1]

George F. Zook, admittedly a "higher education" man, also attempted to divert Palmer's fears into hopes. Zook's main point was that junior colleges would not take all freshmen and sophomore students by any means, They would actually protect the four-year colleges and universities, argued Zook, by serving the masses and allowing the more scholarly institutions to work with a better type of student. Although junior colleges did have programs for college bound students and pre-professional students, Zook explained, they would serve primarily a third type of group--students fitted by nature and interest to semiprofessions in business, home economics, technichal work, and possibly teaching. Zook assured the four-year colleges and universities that there would be an ample student population for all types of institutions, and that the junior colleges were doing them a service by accommodating this lower grade of student.[1]

---

[1] Eells, The Junior College, pp. 344-345.

Retreating from the battlefield as he said he would, Palmer was a short-lived foe of the junior college movement. No prominent figure emerged to continue the fight. Fifteen years later, William H. Cowley, also using the pages of the Atlantic Monthly, again sounded the alarm that the four-year college was being threatened, but his accusations were directed against Robert M. Hutchins' efforts at the University of Chicago, not the junior college movement. In fact, Cowley quoted Eells, then Executive Secretary of AAJC, as opposed to Hutchins' idea to grant the bachelor's degree at the end of junior college.[2] No one at all, at least no one whom the community-junior college national spokesmen felt called upon to answer, continued to press the question raised by Palmer concerning inferior education for the poor.

An exhaustive listing of all of the friends of the community-junior college movement would indeed involve a lengthy project. From the perspective of this study, however, it can be said that one supporting agent--the General Education Board--was most clearly identified by community-junior college national spokesmen during this era as the greatest assistance in formulating and propagating ideas on junior colleges. The junior college movement really had little to fear from isolated individuals, like Palmer, sounding academic alarms when it had the financial and organizational help of a leading educational foundation.

---

[1] George F. Zook, "Is the Junior College a Menace or a Boon?," School Review, XXXVII (June, 1929), 418-419.

[2] William H. Cowley, "The War on the College," Atlantic Monthly, June, 1942, pp. 719-726; Eells explains his defection from the plans of his alma mater in Walter Crosby Eells, "Developments in Higher Education--Wise and Otherwise," Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, XVII (July, 1942), 475.

AAJC had been looking for such support for years. In 1926 L. W. Smith, then President of AAJC, reported to the AAJC convention that a committee was being formed to begin a search for foundational support.[1] No foundation support was forthcoming, however. In 1930, when the Carnegie Commission decided to invest in a study of higher education in California, in large part to formulate national recommendations for junior college development, AAJC was struggling along with a total yearly budget just over $2,000 and no salaried staff.[2] It is probable that Doak S. Campbell was instrumental in securing the assistance of the General Education Board in 1939 which gave a major boost to AAJC. The General Education Board had funded many projects for the Commission on Curriculum Problems and Research of the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges, of which Campbell was a member.[3] Campbell chaired the AAJC Commission on Junior College Terminal Education which was formed in 1939 to spearhead efforts for a greater emphasis on terminal education, and it was natural that he turned to the General Education Board for backing. Dr. Robert J. Havinghurst, director of general education for the General Education Board, met with the AAJC Commission and was receptive to their idea for a major study of the status and potential of terminal education in junior colleges, and he promised to take them to the General Education Board.

Members of the Commission fretted during the later part of 1939 as Havinghurst's proposal for support of the study was tabled by the General Education Board, which was involved in determining its role vis-a-vis the new World War in Europe.[1] Finally, in December, 1939, the General Education Board considered the matter and provided a $25,000 grant to the Commission for a one-year study "concerned particularly with courses and curricula of a semiprofessional and general character designed to give this increasing body of young people greater economic competence and civic responsibility."[2] In 1940 the General Education Board provided nearly twice as much money for a continuation of the study and another $60,000 to eight institutions, six of which were public junior colleges, for specific institutional programs or studies in terminal education.[3]

---

[1] L. W. Smith, in a discussion during the business session, Proceedings of the Seventh Annual AAJC Meeting (Jackson, Mississippi, 1926), p. 60.

[2] Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 55.

[3] Fawcett, "Doak S. Campbell," p. 78.

The impact of the Junior College Terminal Education study was not as far reaching as other projects financed by the General Education Board, such as Columbia's Lincoln School or the Progressive Education (or Eight-Year) study. The Commission allowed Eells great freedom in conducting the study, apparently forgiving him for his disloyalty to the 6-4-4 plan a decade earlier.[4] The main products of the study were two books by Eells which have already been frequently quoted in this chapter, The Present Status of Terminal Education and Why Junior College Terminal Education?.[5]

---

[1] Letter from Walter Crosby Eells to Members of the AAJC Policy Committee, November 14, 1939, AAJC Archives. "Policy Committee" was the original name given to the Commission on Junior College Terminal Education.

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, "Junior College Terminal Education," Junior College Journal, X (January, 1940), 244.

[3] Eells, The Present Status of Terminal Education, pp. 188-190.

[4] Other junior college spokesmen in this study who were members of the AAJC Commission on Junior College Terminal Education, besides Campbell the chairman and Eells the director, were Koos, Zook, Colvert, and Medsker. The total number on the Commission was thirteen.

[5] A third volume of lesser significance did result from the study, but it was only a bibliography of literature on terminal education. Lois E. Engleman and Walter Crosby Eells, The Literature of Junior College Terminal Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941).

They added nothing new to the basic arguments in favor of terminal education, but they synthesized the old arguments and presented a forceful case for the need for terminal education and its unfortunate neglect. The books emphasized, as might be expected, the different levels of student abilities on a single scale of intelligence, the needs of the economy and the society, the importance of guidance, and the general idea of the semiprofessions--in short, all the standard features of rhetoric on the junior college during the 1920's and 1930's. Whatever impact Eells' books might have had on the community-junior college movement, and such influence is always difficult to measure, it was probably less significant than the fact that the General Education Board grant allowed AAJC to grow into a sizeable organization, recognizably at the forefront of junior college development. The budgeting and staffing of the terminal education was not independent of the AAJC operating budget and staff. Eells, who was half-time Director of the study admitted that his work was so "closely intertwined" that he made no effort to keep his two jobs entirely distinct.[1] After the war, other foundations would come to the support of AAJC, allowing it to continue, in the words of Michael Brick, as the forum and focus of the community-junior college movement.[2]

Rhetoric and Reality

The specific purpose of this study is to determine the major ideas and ideals expressed by community-junior college spokesmen regarding education and society. With such a focus, one could easily be led to a distorted picture of what community-junior colleges were actually like. Such a distortion could be the natural result of a focus on ideals rather than actualities and also a result of the fact that ideologies, by their very nature, tend to obscure reality in order to obtain allegience to the abstract. To keep an historical perspective of general community-junior college development while tracing its ideological development, it might be well to touch briefly upon the matter of institutional growth, to compare rhetoric with reality.

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, "Annual Report of the Executive Secretary," Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 498.

[2] Brick, Forum and Focus, pp. 57-61.

First of all it should be noted that the unity existing in the community-junior college ideology during the 1920's and 1930's stands in sharp contrast to the diversity of institutions operating under the name of "junior colleges." Mention has already been made of the split between public and private junior colleges, denied in the ideology but happening in actuality. At the beginning of the 1920's, private junior colleges outnumbered public ones two to one and held firm control over AAJC. Of the twenty-two junior colleges represented at the 1920 organizational meeting of AAJC, only five were public, and none of these were junior colleges in California, the state that was leading the movement by 1940.[1] McDowell identified 39 public junior colleges at the end of World War One; by 1940 the number had increased to 258. While still in the minority (the number of private junior colleges in 1940 was 317) among junior college institutions, the public junior colleges enrolled over two-thirds of all junior college students.[2] Increasingly, the rhetoric of the community-junior college was geared to local, public junior colleges to the exclusion of the private colleges, despite conscious efforts to be all inclusive.

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, "Junior College Patriarchs," Junior College Journal, X (February, 1940), 307-309.

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, ed., American Junior Colleges (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940), p. 18.

There were other specific types of junior colleges that could be mentioned, but they too seemed to have little effect upon the general rhetoric generated by the community-junior college movement. Some junior colleges existed within universities, as integral units or as branch campuses, and others were unmistakably technical institutes. Many of the private colleges were denominational with a religious curriculum dominant, but this feature was only footnoted upon occasion in the writings of community-junior college spokesmen. All types of junior colleges had an interest in preparatory and/or terminal programs and thus the terminology of the community-junior spokesmen was not foreign to any of them. On the other hand, the full range of interests represented in the community-junior college movement more and more typified the community, public type of junior college.

Some new purposes for community-junior colleges began to appear in the stated goals of the national spokesmen during the 1920's and 1930's--adult education and community service--generally reflecting actual programs being developed. These were minor themes indeed compared to the major emphasis upon terminal education and guidance, but their growth after World War Two would be sufficient to make the term "community-junior college" take on a special significance. Walter Crosby Eells wrote the most about the role of junior colleges in adult education, but this departure from the mainstream of junior college thought found few more followers in his day than his campaign to relocate the junior college in higher, rather than secondary, education.[1] The community service function of community-junior colleges was not singled out by any of the spokesmen for repeated emphasis, but occasional remarks about serving the local community in various ways appeared here and there in the literature. It is probable that the minor role played by adult education and community service in the community-junior college ideology corresponded in large part with meager community-junior college programs in those areas. At any rate, the turn in the ideology toward emphasis upon the local community had not yet become a noticeable shift by 1941.

---

[1] Eells made a strong case for adult education in the junior college in several of his articles. See "Adjustments in the Junior College Curriculum," p. 409; "Adult Education in California Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, V (May, 1935), 448; and "Pioneer Trail or Educational Highway," Junior College Journal, (November, 1935), 55-56.

A final note of realism has been sounded already in the arguments of the community-junior college national spokesmen, but its importance is such that it bears repeating. Despite the ideological consensus reached by the spokesmen on the need to promote more terminal education, an agreement even extending to what was the most effective means to achieve that end--a system of guidance, students who attended community-junior colleges throughout this period (and indeed after) continued to enroll, in the ratio of two to one, in university transfer programs. The percentage of students actually transferring on to four-year colleges and universities remained quite constant, too, varying slightly from fifty percent of the number enrolling in transfer curricula. The refusal of so-called "terminal students" to enroll in terminal curricula was destined to remain to the present day a continuing source of both challenge and frustration for adherents to the community-junior college ideology.

CHAPTER IV

ACCEPTANCE WITHOUT UNDERSTANDING

Before World War One, the community-junior college was more of an idea than an institution. During the 1920's and 1930's, the community-junior college struggled to establish itself, in some form or another, within the structure of American education. During these formative years, community-junior colleges had to face the divisive problem of reconciling theory and practice and at the same time remain unified enough to win public support for their common cause. Some states were notably successful before the 1940's, particularly California, in building a viable system of community-junior colleges, but most of the nation did not accept the fledgling institutions as bona fide institutions in American education until the end of World War Two.

Then, almost overnight, the community-junior college was accepted into the nationwide American educational system as a full-fledged member. To all appearances, and perhaps in fact, this was a result of the "flood-tide" of students pouring into higher education after the war, rather than the result of public subscription to the community-junior college ideology which had been in the making for half a century. Whatever the cause, the acceptance of the community-junior college was complete. Presidential commissions, NEA committees, various national foundations, and the national news media supported and popularized the case for the community-junior college. There was no notable opposition. By 1970, AAJC listed over one thousand institutional members from all 50 states enrolling nearly two and one-half million students, more than the total of freshmen and sophomore students in the nation's four-year colleges and universities.[1]

At the same time that the community-junior college was achieving security as an institution, it continued to struggle with ideological questions concerning its purpose in society and the ideal curriculum for workers in an industrial state. The struggle was an exasperating one, since there were few leaders sounding ideological truths which struck responsive chords in the rhetoric of the national spokesmen for the movement. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. was aware of this lack of ideological leadership in formulating ideas on the role of the community-junior college. In his first annual report to AAJC as its new Executive Director in 1959, Gleazer expressed his regret that articulate leaders such as Harper, Jordan, Lange, and Koos did not have counterparts in the 1950's. He went on to say:

> . . . it is striking to note that a majority of the "idea people" in the field have been university presidents and the attention of some of these men was given less to the nature of the junior college than to the improvement of the university structure and program which might result from eliminating the freshmen and sophomore years. What I am saying is that there are thinkers and spokesmen needed in this junior college field as it grows in stature and maturity.[2]

Although community-junior college leaders were concerned that the public did not understand their institutions and often referred to an "identity crisis," the lack of public understanding did not seem to hinder the growth of their institutions. Jesse P. Bogue, when he was Executive Secretary of AAJC,[3] noted the irony of the public's acceptance of community-junior colleges without understanding them. Bogue reported that a state legislator had said to him shortly after the end of World War Two:

---

[1] Directory of AAJC, 1971, p. 6.

[2] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Executive Director's Report to the American Association of Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, XXIX (May, 1959), 556.

[3] The title of AAJC's director changed from Executive Secretary to Executive Director in 1958 when Gleazer succeeded Bogue in the position. See Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 48.

> "We believe in junior colleges and want them. We are ready to act, but we don't know enough about this phase of education to draft a bill."[1]

Community-junior college national spokesmen tried to overcome their so-called "identity crisis" during the 1950's and 1960's with a new name and a new image. They began to speak, uncomfortably at first, of the "community college," and they carefully defined an ever growing set of functions--transfer, terminal, and general education; adult education; community service; the remedial or salvage function; student personnel services; etc. But an agreement upon a name and functions was not enough. The underlying ideology of the movement which would give meaning to the functions, and perhaps help establish priorities among them, remained blurred. There did not appear to be men who could place the "community college's" role in sharp focus.

The lack of profound thinkers may have been the major weakness in community-junior college leadership, as Gleazer suggested. Speculation raises other possibilities. It could have been that bureaucratization infected the community-junior college movement, causing its leaders to think in terms of perpetuating certain activities and reinforcing the value of routine functions. Once the movement itself began to stabilize, it is possible that new vistas seemed less enticing than secure operations. When Merle Curti revised his book on the social ideas of American educators in 1959 (it was originally published in 1935), he stated that a similar biographical study of the more contemporary period should probably not be attempted since few leaders stand out;[1] perhaps then the shortage of inspiring community-junior college leaders is not unusual for the times. Then again, it may be that contemporary community-junior college spokesmen have in fact constructed rich ideological supports for the movement, and that their precise nature eludes those who unconsciously share the same ideological outlook and thus cannot question it critically.

---

[1] Jesse P. Bogue, "Some Critical Problems in Junior Colleges," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXII (March, 1947), 145.

To continue speculation about why the present generation of community-junior college national spokesmen lacks a forceful ideology, the methodology of this study should not be overlooked. The publishing criterion that determined the spokesmen to be studied operated in favor of selecting patriarchs in the movement who, for the most part, have been publishing their thoughts on the community-junior college over several decades. Many exciting new writers on the community-junior college scene who are trying to infuse contemporary and powerful ideas into the ideological support for the movement have not been considered, and this omission will be discussed more fully in Chapter V. But to try to separate new ideological components which will be lasting from those which are fleeting is no easy matter. The writings of the elder statesmen of the movement are probably still the best historical sources with which to determine ideological trends.

For the most part, the social role conceived for the community-junior college in the ideological view of the national spokesmen during the past quarter century has developed few new aspects. The new emphasis on more comprehensive functions to convert the "junior college" into a "community college" was not symptomatic of any new ideological impulse. Encyclopedic listings of functions, growing in length from year to year, had a spiritless quality to them. No one function seemed to be more or less important than any other; few ideological campaigns were launched to encourage some and discourage others. There continued to be much discussion about too many transfer students and too few terminal students, and the importance of more vocational curricula and more effective guidance was consistently upheld. But the discussions were different from those in the past in one important way: they were aimed at ways to improve society, not to perfect it. While some missionary zeal lingered, the new generation of community-junior college national spokesmen sounded more like managers of business firms, willing to accept reasonable profits and determined to insure the steady growth of their product. The entrepreneurs of the community-junior college movement who were set upon building a new enterprise to fulfill a dream belonged to the past.

---

[1] Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators, pp. xxv-xxvii.

New Spokesmen for the Community-Junior College Movement

In this chapter, as in the last, an introduction of the period's selected national community-junior college spokesmen will precede a topical analysis of major aspects of the developing community-junior college ideology. Five of the spokesmen received a brief introduction in Chapter III--Johnson, Reynolds, Medsker, Colvert, and Bogue--since their entry into the community-junior college movement came near the end of the 1930's. In addition to these five, two newcomers will be discussed--Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. and S. V. Martorana--and some continuing voices from the past will be considered also.

B. Lamar Johnson, it will be remembered, launched his career at Stephens College in the 1930's, taking up many of the concerns for progressive, life-adjustment curricula that had characterized the lifetime efforts of

Stephens' President James M. Wood. By the 1940's Johnson had established his own reputation as a staunch and articulate defender of general education for everyone. There was a feeling among many community-junior college leaders that general education, at least in their institutions, should be a curriculum of citizenship training for terminal students only. Asked by the AAJC Committee on Curriculum and Adult Education to prepare a report for membership on general education, Johnson attacked this limited conception of general education and emphasized that every student needed general training:

> Regardless of whether he is going to be a lawyer or a filling-station operator, a librarian or a secretary, he will be a citizen. . . . There is among educators general agreement about the objectives of general education, about the type of citizen we want trained in our schools and colleges. There is, however, a wide divergence of opinion about the best means of achieving these objectives.[1]

Johnson offered his suggestion on the best means of achieving general education in the community-junior college in the same article. He identified five types of general education--the Great Books approach, a study of the liberal arts, surveys of fields of knowledge, individualized study, and functional subject matter based on "life-needs of students and on the demands of the society in which they are going to live"--and then proceded to argue by elimination that the later approach was the correct one in community-junior colleges. The Great Books approach and a study of a liberal arts curriculum, Johnson stated, were quite suitable for a highly selected, intelligent study body, but not the masses found in the junior colleges. Individualized study Johnson considered desirable for all, but it was clearly too expensive a proposition for the large numbers of junior college students to be individually tutored. Johnson approved of the survey course idea in broad fields of knowledge, but he thought that its overall impact would be a limited one. He concluded:

---

[1] B. Lamar Johnson, "Patterns of General Education," Junior College Journal, XVII (October, 1946), 45.

> It is clear to the writer . . . that the junior college curriculum should move in the direction of the functional subject matter approach, with subject matter selected on the basis of life-needs of the American citizen, instruction offered and counseling provided on the basis of individual student needs and interests.[1]

The question of determining an American citizen's "life-needs" is something that will be considered more carefully later, but here it is appropriate to discuss Johnson's effort to make such a determination. A grant from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching allowed Johnson to conduct a fourteen month study during 1950-1951 to determine the content of an appropriate general education curriculum for junior colleges and to help junior colleges overcome whatever problems might exist in establishing such a curriculum. The study was to be in California, a state in which the Carnegie Foundation had already invested considerable funds advancing the junior college movement. Johnson moved to the campus of the University of California at Los Angeles to conduct the study, and he has remained there as a professor of higher education ever since. Out of the study came a book, General Education in Action, explaining the methods and outcomes of the study.[2]

Johnson brought together junior college personnel in California in workshops and conferences in an effort to reach consensus on general education. Workshops were held during the summers of 1950 and 1951, and conferences during the year found Johnson on 41 various campuses working with 4,300 participants in the study. The first summer workshop set an important mark by accepting Johnson's recommendation that general education should be defined in "outcomes," rather than course content or learning processes. Twelve goals of general education were formally specified by the 1950 workshop, prefaced with their insistence that general education complemented rather than conflicted with vocational education and that general education, to be truly functional would have to be adapted to the different "experiences, needs, capacities, interests, and aspirations" which characterized the diverse junior college student population.[1] As more general education conferences took place during 1950-1951, Johnson found that the idea of a general education curriculum based on behavioral outcomes, stated in terms of life-adjustment and life-needs, and differing according to the differing needs of various types of students, was in favor throughout the state. The difference among California junior college educators over such matters as "intellectual" vs. "the whole person" emphasis, specific general education courses or general education in all courses, and the ratio of required to elective general education courses, did not seem as important to Johnson as the common agreement on goals and on functional, behavioral means.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 50.

[2] B. Lamar Johnson, General Education in Action (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952).

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 3. The twelve goals of general education, which the workshop members resolved must be measured behaviorally, were to help each student increase his competence in: (1) Exercising the privileges and responsibilities of democratic citizenship; (2) Developing a set of sound moral and spiritual values by which he guides his life; (3) Expressing his thoughts clearly in speaking and writing, and in reading and listening with understanding; (4) Using the basic mathematical and mechanical skills necessary in everyday life; (5) Using methods of critical thinking for the solution of problems and for the discrimination among values; (6) Understanding his cultural heritage so that he may gain a perspective of his time and place in the world; (7) Understanding his interaction with his biological and physical environment so that he may better adjust to and improve that environment; (8) Maintaining good mental and physical health for himself, his family, and his community; (9) Developing a balanced personal and social adjustment; (10) Sharing in the development of a satisfactory home and family life; (11) Achieving a satisfactory vocational adjustment; and (12) Taking part in some form of satisfying creative activity and in appreciating the creative activities of others.

The value of general education for the individual and society was consistently expressed by Johnson in functional terms too. It would counteract the rising divorce rate, curb mental disorders, provide acceptable activities to fill the leisure-time needs of Americans, underscore common humanity, and be a step toward lasting world peace. The utility of general education was such, argued Johnson, that it should appeal to the practicality of those urging more vocational studies. More employees lose their jobs because of "undesirable character traits," Johnson stated, than lack of technical skills, and he quoted a study which set the ratio at nine to one.[2] Thus, Johnson's definition of general education was not greatly different from the emphasis placed on "terminal education" before World War One. While he did emphasize more the development of self-fulfilling, individual leisure-time activities and denied that junior colleges should build a general education curriculum for one particular intermediate class in society, his idea of the good worker and the good citizen, and the proper means of training such a person, did not seem to vary a great deal from earlier aims of the community-junior college ideology. It will be noted several times in the pages which follow that several leaders in the community-junior college movement called for a new dedication to general education in the 1940's and 1950's, as opposed to what they thought had been an earlier emphasis upon terminal and vocational education. In most cases we will see that these leaders, like Johnson, repeated more of the ideas of the terminal education advocates than they challenged.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 36-52. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

But if Johnson was traditional in his aims for general education, this did not carry over to the methods he recommended to achieve them. Johnson never abandoned his commitment to pedagogic experimentalism formed during his days at Stephens College. In the 1960's he spent most of his professional efforts trying to break the traditional mold which was uniformly shaping community-junior college curricula. He gave nation-wide attention to "islands of innovation" in the traditional sea of community-junior college offerings in an attempt to encourage more. For the most part, however, Johnson found that the great potential for the community-junior college to do new things in new ways was being continually eroded by tradition and inertia.[1] But while Johnson offered new techniques and innovative curricular ideas, even encouraging community-junior colleges to employ Vice-Presidents in Charge of Heresy,[2] he did not offer a new vision of an ideal society to stimulate ideological enthusiasm and unity. He settled mostly for tired cliches from the past.

James W. Reynolds has been a professor in junior college education at the University of Texas since the late 1940's, several years after his senior colleague C. C. Colvert joined the staff there. From 1949 to 1963 he served as the editor of the Junior College Journal. Earlier in his career, from 1937 to 1945, he had been Dean of Ft. Smith Junior College in Arkansas, a position he left for academe after receiving his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1945. After a few years of teaching at the

---

[1] See the following by B. Lamar Johnson: Islands of Innovation, Occasional Report No. 6 (Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, 1964); "Needed: Experimental Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, XXXVI (October, 1965), 17-20; "Encouraging Innovation in Teaching," Junior College Journal, XXXIX (March, 1969), 18-22; Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969).

[2] Johnson, "Needed: Experimental Junior Colleges," p. 20.

University of Georgia and George Peabody College for Teachers, Reynolds was attracted to the University of Texas. From his professorial position at Texas, Reynolds, like Johnson, supported the expanding growth and increasing functions of community-junior colleges with a particular interest in general education.

The actual and assumed extent to which World War Two stimulated increased vocational-technical programs in community-junior colleges will be considered as a separate topic later; suffice it to say for now that community-junior college national spokesmen often reported such stimulation was strong and effective. Reynolds joined with Johnson in a concerted effort to protect and promote general education dealing with social attitudes and values. They were concerned that specialized training was moving ahead at the expense of general education. Reynolds' doctoral work, supported by a grant from the General Education Board, consisted of examining student transcripts and college catalogues, as well as conducting numerous interviews, at over 40 junior colleges in an effort to determine precisely how much emphasis was actually being placed on general education. Since Reynolds accepted the idea that general education could be taught in portions of courses not specifically labeled as general education courses (as long as part of the instruction aimed at forming a desirable philosophy of life and proper social behavior), his task was necessarily complicated. He looked for instruction designed to improve a person's health, communication abilities, personal-social adjustment, family-marital adjustment, citizenship, understanding of the environment, appreciation of literature, adequate personal philosophy, and adequacy in vocational choice. Despite this broad-ranged approach, Reynolds determined, through laborious procedures, that junior colleges, by and large, "were falling far short in the matter of providing an adequate general education program." The percentage of various curricula that was devoted to general education, Reynolds found, ranged from slightly over ten percent in Arts and Sciences to under five percent in Technology.[1]

Reynolds blamed a number of factors for the fact that general education, strong in the rhetoric of the junior college movement, was weak in actual practice. He recognized the restrictive controls impossed by universities upon junior college curricula, controls that could not be ignored if students were to transfer on without loss of credit. He also realized that many junior college administrators thought of general education as a terminal curriculum for only some students, and thus they neglected to see to its inclusion in preparatory and vocational curricula. But the primary fault, according to Reynolds, was in the training of junior college personnel, training that attended to their own specialities rather than ensuring a well-rounded background.[2] Reynolds thus directed much of this effort toward general teacher training as a method of achieving better instruction in general education in the junior college.

Reynolds, unlike most of the other community-junior college national spokesmen of the era, maintained a consistent view of community-junior college functions during the 1950's and 1960's. He stuck with four major categories, consistently arranging them in the same order: general education; preparatory education; vocational education; and community service.[3]

---

[1] James W. Reynolds, "General Education in Public Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, XVI (March, 1946), 308-319.

[2] James W. Reynolds, "General Education and the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XX (January, 1950), 239.

[3] This feature appears in many of Reynolds' writings. The clearest statement is in James W. Reynolds, The Junior College (New York: Center for Applied Research, Inc., 1965), pp. 28-44.

Sometimes guidance appeared as a fifth function, but Reynolds pointed out that guidance was more of a supporting service to the four main functions. If Reynolds' ordering of the functions was indicative of the importance he attached to them, he never admitted it overtly. But he was less willing than most other national spokesmen to see the term "community college" win wide-spread acceptance at the cost of blurring a clear delineation of functions. While others in the movement were adjusting their rhetoric to the new sound of "community college" and attempting to construct ever more inclusive listings of community college functions, Reynolds consciously kept his writings geared to the "junior college."[1] Reynolds was not playing the role of a reactionary; he had no objection to the title of "community college" if in fact the institutions referred to as such really met the extensive criteria that he maintained were necessary to justify the name. These criteria were a sensitivity to needed curricula in the community, cultural activities beyond the classroom, faculty and student competencies being applied to community problems, community participation in curriculum making, the use of the community as an instructional laboratory, effective public relations, and a system of evaluating the college's success in serving all elements in the community.[2] Colleges that meet these criteria could appropriately be called "community colleges" from Reynolds' point of view. But Reynolds did not want the idea to develop that all junior colleges should be community colleges. On the contrary, he believed that the trend toward expanded purposes and flexible programs was causing a great deal of difficulty and confusion and that a more limited, clearer role for the junior college was needed.[1] Many four-year colleges and municipal universities, observed Reynolds, had just as much right to be considered community colleges as did two-year institutions. Logic, not reaction, claimed Reynolds in 1969, leads to this conclusion: "Not all junior colleges are community colleges; not all community colleges are junior colleges."[2] Reynolds' logic notwithstanding, however, the term "community college" was becoming a synonym, one which generally carried a more positive connotation, for "junior college" in the rhetoric of the community-junior college national spokesmen.

---

[1] One place that this is apparent is in the titles that Reynolds has selected for his major works on the community-junior college: The Junior College in 1965 and his most recent book, The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1969).

[2] James W. Reynolds, "What is a Community College," Junior College Journal, XXI (December, 1950), 202.

Reynolds' dissention on the name of what we have been calling community-junior colleges was more than a semantic argument. Reynolds was challenging the clarity of thinking in the movement as a whole. He charged that the same type of confusion surrounded "terminal education." This term which became popular in the 1920's and 1930's continued to be used with great frequency by community-junior college spokesmen into the early 1960's, at which time it fell out of favor. Reynolds objected to the term because it was not clear whether it applied to students or curricula and also because it wrongly implied that a point exists in life at which education should terminate. His solution was to label curricula general, preparatory, or vocational and to label students terminal, transfer, or adult. He did not argue to change the meaning of terminal education but to clarify its meaning with more precise terminology.[3] Reynolds did not contain his charge of sloppy thinking to only two terms. He broadened his attack by stating that the general rhetoric of the junior college movement was suffering from folklore. Reynolds argued that folklore, which he defined as "traditional beliefs or sayings, especially those of a legendary nature, preserved unreflectingly," was acquired by institutions as they attained age. In half a century the junior college, he thought, had acquired quite a few, such as beliefs in superior instruction, lower costs, smaller class sizes, greater attention to community needs, and greater leadership opportunities for youth. Reynolds did not deny the truth of these beliefs, but he called for more evidence and less faith in the support of them.[1]

---

[1] James W. Reynolds, "What is a Junior College?," Junior College Journal, XXX (April, 1960), pp. 427-428.

[2] Reynolds, The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum, p. vi.

[3] James W. Reynolds, "Terminal Education," Junior College Journal, XX (December, 1949), 177-178.

Reynolds' writings were not always as clear as he hoped others would be. In a 1962 editorial in the Junior College Journal, Reynolds seemed to depart from his customary set of junior college functions by stating that junior colleges needed to redefine their functions in terms of what was going on in the hearts and minds of students, not in terms of institutional functions. He then proceeded to outline what this set of functions based on student perspectives might be: preparatory education; vocational education; general education; instruction; guidance; and the increased availability of educational opportunities.[2] No clue is given as to how these functions were derived from students, and Reynolds' later writings reverted to his customary view of four functions.

There were times when Reynolds did sound quite reactionary, or counterrevolutionary if one prefers that term. In 1959 he charged in another

---

[1] James W. Reynolds, "The Folklore of Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (September, 1959), 1-2.

[2] James W. Reynolds, "Images or Services of Junior Colleges?," Junior College Journal, XXXII (September, 1962), 1-2.

Junior College Journal editorial that colleges which adjusted their curriclums fully to the interests of the students and did not screen the students were not doing their part to "conserve human resources." He stated:

> The writer has no patience with a trend that long existed in the area of higher education and among certain institutions to "adjust" the curriculum continually to the mediocrity of a given student body. He feels that rescuing higher education from the morass of guaranteeing every applicant a college degree even through the graduate level must stop if this segment of the educational system is to accomplish what it should.[1]

By 1969, however, Reynolds again seemed to be promoting a strongly student-centered general education program. Lamenting the fact that post-World War Two forces were destroying general education, forces such as the post-Sputnik scientific craze, vocational education subsidies from Congress, and the needs of industry, Reynolds looked hopefully to the emerging demands of students for relevant courses to preserve general education.[2]

Leland L. Medsker, who worked at both Wilson Junior College (Chairman of the Business Division) and Wright Junior College (Dean) as well as the Bureau of Occupational Research and Guidance for the public schools when he was in Chicago during the 1930's and 1940's, was introduced in Chapter III as a community-junior college spokesman advocating closer links with industry. After World War Two, Medsker, perhaps more than any other figure in the movement, became the spokesman for the full range of comprehensive community-junior college functions, a wide-ranging defense that well affords him the oft-mentioned title of "Mr. Junior College." Medsker received a M.B.A. degree from Northwestern University in 1935, and after World War Two he entered graduate study at the University of Chicago. When Medsker accepted the position as director of East Contra Costa Junior College in California in 1950, however, he transferred his graduate study to Stanford University, where he received an Ed.D. degree in 1954. Medsker stayed as director at East Contra Costa Junior College, also teaching part-time at Stanford, until 1956 when he took a position at the University of California at Berkeley. In 1960, Medsker was appointed professor of higher education at Berkeley and also Vice-Chairman of the Center for Research and Development of Higher Education; he has been Director of the Center since 1967.[1]

---

[1] James W. Reynolds, "Conservation of Human Resources," Junior College Journal XXX (September, 1959), 1-2.

[2] Reynolds, The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum, pp. 193-194.

Medsker's expansive conception of the nature, real, and ideal, of the junior college was nurtured during the early 1940's when he succeeded Eells as the director of the continuing terminal education study. In that capacity, he attended workshops in California, Tennessee, Illinois, and Massachusetts, and he visited numerous campuses. With the outbreak of war, the conferences and visits took on a concern not anticipated when the study was first funded by the General Education Board in 1940, a concern that broadened Medsker's outlook beyond vocational education. Defense training and terminal education seemed to merge into a single concern for technical competence against the backdrop of war, but even more importantly general education, designed to insure democratic ascendancy over competing ideologies, gained a special significance. Medsker observed that winning the war involved "not only how to fight a war but why it should be fought."[2] With Medsker, as with most other community-junior college national spokesmen, World War Two impressed upon him the importance of a wide range of educational activities aimed at good citizenship rather than focusing his attention on the narrow field of technical training.

---

[1] Personal information on Medsker obtained from Who's Who in America, Vol. XXXVI, 1970-1971, p. 1541.

[2] See the following two articles by Medsker: "Reports on Study of Terminal Education," Junior College Journal, XII (March, 1942), 399-400; and "The Wartime Role of Our Junior Colleges," School Executive, LXII (January, 1943), 19.

After the war, Medsker was outspoken in the defense of adult education, community service, and new curricula to meet all conceivable community needs. He was one of the earliest community-junior college national spokesmen to support the idea of a multi-purposed "community college," although he was slower to adopt the name than the functions.[1] While a strong promoter of the community-junior college movement, Medsker was aware of shortcomings in the movement's ideology. In 1960 he appeared before the members of the Association for Higher Education and catalogued the many functions of the rapidly developing junior college. He admitted, however, that agreement on functions without somehow determining their relative importance was not enough to keep the junior college a vital institution. He stated:

> It is exceedingly important that those responsible for junior colleges give serious thought to their central role. Identification of the many functions is important too, but the functions take on meaning only when they are related to the central purpose of the entity.[2]

In the late 1950's, Medsker undertook a study of the nation's junior colleges with a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. It was the most ambitious study of the nation's community-junior colleges since the terminal education study of the early 1940's, and it resulted in the most authoritative work on the junior college available in the 1960's.[1] Medsker reported that the junior college was "the most effective democratizing agent in higher education," not only because it made higher education available to larger numbers of students at low cost, but also because it offered the diversity of programs to be an effective "distributing agency." And the junior college could distribute students even more effectively, Medsker maintained, if the students' "disdain for occupational training," which was "simply a cultural factor that causes students to covet the reputation of being a preparatory student," could be overcome.[2]

---

[1] See Leland L. Medsker, "The Role of the Junior College in Community Educational Service," Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, XX (1948), 64-66.

[2] Leland L. Medsker, "What is the Most Constructive Role for the Junior Colleges?," Current Issues in Higher Education: Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual National Conference on Higher Education (Chicago, 1960), p. 196.

While Medsker's study focused a great deal of attention on the transfer student, proving that he was nearly as good academically as his counterpart in four-year colleges and universities, he also voiced the long-standing concern about the large number of self proclaimed transfer students who never transferred and whose presence at the junior college he determined to be a social waste. Like previous junior college leaders who addressed themselves to this problem, Medsker assumed that the terminal nature of these students required a suitable curriculum to fit them most effectively into American society. He dismissed the suggestion that more should actually transfer on to higher levels of education and maintained that "the junior college may well perform a maximum service if only a third of its students transfer."[3] Medsker also called attention to the high attrition rates of junior colleges, amounting to nearly half of those students who begin study in them. Noting that this drop-out rate generally coincided with the drop-out rates for four-year colleges and universities, Medsker did not find it alarming, but he puzzled over whether the drop-out rate, coupled with the fate of the non-transferring "transfer student," meant that the junior college was forcing students to be realistic or whether it was failing to encourage able students to continue. To insure the former rather than the latter, Medsker advocated a strong student personnel program.[1] Medsker cited James Conant's pertinent observation that:

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960).

[2] Ibid., p. 113. [3] Ibid., p. 112.

> It would be easier if American philosophy condoned the arbitrary channeling of students into educational programs according to some a priori basis instead of according to the student's free will.[2]

In the absence of such a system, Medsker joined a long tradition of community-junior college spokesmen who looked to the guidance system, referred to by Medsker, with the addition of several other service functions, as the junior college student personnel program.

Medsker also made strong cases for junior college functions in his 1960 study beyond the standard ones of terminal and transfer education and guidance. He supported adult education, community service, and general education. He expanded the list of commonly held functions by identifying another one--the remedial or salvage function which gave to unsuccessful high school students a second chance to prove their academic worth.[3] When Medsker turned to the matter of junior college shortcomings, he made two interesting observations. First of all, Medsker charged that junior colleges, despite all of the good they were doing, were failing to meet their own claims. He found no emphasis on terminal education in junior college programs to match the emphasis on terminal education in the rhetoric of the movement. Student personnel services, he further charged, were failing to channel students "into avenues consistent with their characteristics and their likelihood of success." And general education programs Medsker found to be generally weak, a shortcoming he noted which seemed to be of little concern to junior college faculties and administrations.[1] The second major shortcoming in the junior college movement that Medsker noted was its "slowness in achieving an identity." He was disturbed that doubts continued about whether the junior college belonged in secondary or higher education, and whether the state or the community was obligated to support it. He called for consensus on the issue of whether a junior college education was a "birthright" of every American child or a privilege which could and should be restricted. He found dissention on these questions existing among junior college spokesmen in various states and even within the same college.[2] But his charge of the junior college lack of identity and its internal disunity was not accompanied with any unifying, idealistic conception to overcome the problems. "Mr. Junior College" was apparently not the man to offer a unifying and inspirational ideology to the troubled movement.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 97. [2] Ibid., p. 142. [3] Ibid., p. 22.

Medsker was conscious of the stagnation of ideas in the junior college movement and, like Reynolds, thought that less mythology and more realism was needed. Pointing to the fact that little progress had been made in twenty years in defining the essential nature of the junior college, Medsker told AAJC conventioners in 1958 that it was time to think realistically, not evangelically or defensively, about the junior college:

> On the one hand we have frequently been over-zealous about the junior college, even to the point of becoming evangelistic on its behalf. On the other hand, we have frequently felt left out as if we were poor cousins of higher education and have reacted accordingly . . . It may be that in many instances we have done too much talking to ourselves, saying the things

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 23-26. [2] Ibid., p. 27.

> about the junior college we most like to hear and sometimes emphasizing what is theory rather than what is fact.[1]

Medsker and Reynolds' belief that realism was needed to bring unity and a rededication within the community-junior college movement has to be challenged by one conscious of the role played by ideology in the movement's past. From an historical perspective it seems far more likely that such a unifying development would require a stronger ideology, something that might be far from a realistic description.

C. C. Colvert preceded Reynolds at the University of Texas, arriving there in 1944 as the first full-time professor in junior college education in the nation. Colvert was a protege of Doak S. Campbell; in the 1920's Campbell offered Colvert his first junior college teaching job at Central College in Arkansas and promoted him to his first administrative position. Campbell encouraged Colvert to pursue the doctoral degree and then supervised his work on the Ph.D. which Colvert received from George Peabody College for Teachers in 1937. Upon Campbell's recommendation, Colvert was selected as president of Ouachita Parish Junior College in Monroe, Louisiana, in 1931, where he stayed until moving to Texas in 1944. Like Campbell, Colvert was a Baptist Sunday school teacher and stressed the importance of inculcating the moral values of Godliness, cleanliness, hard work, self-discipline, and obedience in education.[2]

Before receiving his doctoral degree, Colvert did not show the slightest inclination to make the junior college in Monroe anything more than a pale imitation of the first two years of a four-year college liberal-arts curriculum. Even if he had been inclined to expand the scope of the institution, the poverty of the community and the political power of hostile Louisiana State University would probably have prevented his success. Merely to ensure the survival of the junior college on a meager budget required Colvert to be politically active and to accept a compromise in 1933 which placed the institution directly under the control of Louisiana State University.[1] When Colvert returned from a year's leave with his completed doctorate in 1937, however, he was no longer content to accept the status quo. His dissertation, discussed in Chapter II, exposed the deficiencies of junior colleges in providing terminal education, and Colvert must have been sensitive to the fact that his own institution was as deficient as any other in this regard. With the skill he had gained in nearly a decade of involvement in state politics and with his new commitment to develop terminal, vocational curricula, Colvert managed to add new programs in home economics and agriculture and double the college's budget in a single year. When a fellow Baptist deacon attempted unsuccessfully to convince the local Chamber of Commerce that such educational programs were not needed, Colvert accused him of committing a sin. Colvert began also to publicize that adults were more than welcome at the college and initiated some night courses. Aware of the importance of guidance in placing students into terminal programs, Colvert raised funds to sponsor a national guidance conference in Monroe and arranged for Doak Campbell and Gilbert Wrenn to appear on the program.[1] In short, Colvert was making every effort to transform his "junior college" into a "community college."

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker, "Diversity--A Fact and a Responsibility," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (May, 1958), 510.

[2] Personal and professional data on Colvert can be found in Who's Who in America, Vol. XXXVI, 1970-1971, p. 447. A dissertation biography particularly good on Colvert's experiences in Louisiana is Thomas M. Hatfield, "A Junior College Man" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1966).

---

[1] Colvert's involvement in Louisiana state politics during the Huey Long era is a fascinating story, complete with visits to Long when the "Kingfish" received him dressed in pajamas as he once did the German ambassador. Colvert shrewdly played off the factions in the Louisiana legislature to ensure the survival of his college. See Hatfield, "A Junior College Man," pp. 39-75.

World War Two offered Colvert an opportunity to marshal more arguments for the importance of terminal vocational-technical training in the junior college. Three-quarters of the junior college student population really was not fit for pre-professional training, according to Colvert, and yet they were in junior colleges attempting pre-professional curricula. They were capable of being trained as aviation and automobile mechanics, welders, machine operators, clerks, etc., thought Colvert, and as long as the junior colleges had the students he argued they should train them for such war-needed skills.[2] Despite the progress Colvert was making in shaping Monroe's junior college into a community college, (its actual name was Northeast Center of Louisiana State University after the political compromise of 1933, but its operation was similar to a local, public community-junior college), Colvert was ready to move to Texas in 1944. A new state political organization in Louisiana that was jailing many of his political allies threatened to undercut both Colvert and his college. Colvert was not involved in any cases of graft and corruption which were rife in Louisiana politics, and in fact he stood firmly against the use of patronage and sweetheart contracts at his college. All the same, the amount of political power that Colvert had to cultivate to ensure the success of his college was enough to make him a target in Louisiana politics. His exit from that state was timely.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 136-142.

[2] C. C. Colvert, "Junior College Responsibility in Total Defense," Junior College Journal, XI (September, 1940), 3-4.

[3] Hatfield, "A Junior College Man," pp. 167-173.

At the University of Texas in the 1950's and the 1960's, Colvert continued to champion the further growth of junior colleges and all of their expanding functions. He agreed with his colleague Reynolds that junior colleges should not be so quick to change their names to community colleges, mainly because the image of the junior college was taking proper hold and should not be jeopardized by a new name. He did not share Reynolds' feeling that the expanding functions of the institutions was the root cause of growing confusions and the loss of central purpose in the community-junior college movement.[1] Perhaps this is because Colvert never lost in his own mind the urgency of the 1930's for establishing more terminal programs and guiding students into them; expansion around this central idea was growth, not confusion. The importance of guidance, however, was crucial in the proper direction of students into their proper place in the curriculum. In a 1958 Junior College Journal editorial, Colvert summarized several of his main ideas:

> As junior colleges in their expanding role increase in enrollment and develop more varied curriculums in larger districts, well-planned guidance programs will be necessary. Not only will students have to be guided into certain curriculums, but also they will have to be guided away from certain curriculums. The junior college is the people's college and, therefore, must serve all the people. Such a purpose necessitates a guidance program. Administrators, boards, and faculties will have to break away from the all too common practice of weak and ineffective guidance programs.[2]

Jesse P. Bogue (1889-1960) held the influential position of AAJC Executive Secretary from 1946 to 1958. Born and raised in northern Alabama, Bogue's religious zeal came to the attention of the local Methodist minister who assisted Bogue's entry to DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana. He received an A.B. degree from DePauw University in 1914 and shortly thereafter was ordained a Methodist minister. A successful pastor, Bogue served in churches in the Indiana cities of Linden, Bringhurst, and Indianapolis before moving to churches in Knoxville, Tennessee, in 1925 and in Buffalo, New York, in 1929. In 1930, Bogue took the position of Headmaster at the Methodist-supported Troy Conference Academy in Poultney, Vermont. Bogue soon learned that the days of the Academy were numbered since the local townspeople had decided to build a public high school. Bogue convinced the Academy board of trustees to begin a junior college, which they did in 1931 by establishing Green Mountain Junior College and making Bogue its president. The academy existed along side the junior college until 1936 when decreasing attendance caused it to be abolished altogether. Green Mountain Junior College did not suffer with the passing of the academy; it had enjoyed healthy growth and was ready to absorb the facilities left by the defunct academy. Bogue enjoyed his years at Green Mountain and his success as a junior college president. He received a doctor of divinity degree in 1936 from DePauw University in recognition of his religious work, and in 1957, after a decade of service to AAJC, he received the honorary title of Doctor of Pedagogy from Bradley University.[1]

---

[1] C. C. Colvert, "Why Not the Name 'Junior College'?," Junior College Journal, XXVI (September, 1955), 1-2; and C. C. Colvert, "The Expanding Role of the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (January, 1958), 245-246.

[2] Colvert, "The Expanding Role of the Junior College," p. 246.

It was noted in Chapter II that Jesse P. Bogue had a curious yet logical way of blending Christian teachings and life-adjustment pedagogy in his educational philosophy. To Bogue, this was a natural match, just as he argued the "people's college" he directed was a natural extension of the religious academy it replaced. Bogue had to make this connection early in his junior college career, for loyal alumni of the Troy Conference Academy were threatening to scuttle Bogue's plans for the junior college. Bogue managed to allay alumni suspicions with statements such as the following:

---

[1] More information on Bogue's life and career can be found in Lloyd D. Reed, "Jesse Parker Bogue: Missionary for the Two-Year College" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965). Also see C. C. Colvert, "Jesse Parker Bogue," Junior College Journal, XXX (March, 1960), 369-370.

> Your Alma Mater may have added a little to her name. She may have changed her duties and functions somewhat, but she has the same ideals and purposes: namely, to send into the world well-trained young men and women of sound Christian Character.[1]

When Bogue became Executive Secretary of AAJC in 1946, the aftermath of World War Two presented the community-junior college movement with serious problems and at the same time bright prospects. Bogue was alert to both and skillfully directed the Association's efforts toward the maximum growth of community-junior colleges. First there was the problem of few veterans using their G.I. Bill in two-year institutions; this was solved through securing the assistance of the Veteran's Administration and launching a nation-wide publicity campaign. Secondly, proposals for universal military training for all young men at age eighteen or nineteen threatened to interrupt the flow of students from high school to the junior college, and Bogue made many trips to capitol hill to testify that national defense would be better served through combining military and character training in public junior colleges. Not only was universal military service against American traditions, argued Bogue, it would be less effective in achieving the civic unity and technical competence necessary for national preparedness. By expanding R.O.T.C. and by training mechanics, Bogue insisted that junior colleges could provide sound national defense and prevent the type of militarism from developing that he warned had defeated or destroyed all nations that had previously adopted the policy of universal military training. In 1947, Bogue told the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives:

---

[1] Cited in Reed, "Jesse Parker Bogue," p. 25.

> The free American people cannot yet be regimented in their thinking, but may be brought to a workable unity of opinion by education and reason based on hard facts.[1]

Bogue was also aware that the lessons of World War Two offered support for the junior college movement as well as problems. During the war he advised junior college leaders that the depletion of staff and students and the high cost of undertaking technical training programs were temporary strains, and, although this was forcing a few junior colleges to close their doors, the war was offering to those who survived the chance to build terminal programs which would be much desired at the conclusion of the war. The sacrifice of junior colleges during the war, Bogue assured AAJC members, "will ultimately result in good for the junior college as a significant educational movement."[2] After the war, Bogue continued this theme, reminded Congressmen and the public that they had been caught short of trained personnel in the war, and that they should not neglect the junior colleges who had learned how to gear themselves for practical results. Dignified professors of physics, reported Bogue, had to learn during the war "sometimes painfully, to teach practical, down-to-earth courses in electronics, navigation and shop engineering." With limited professional and managerial positions available for post-war youth, Bogue advised, the need for practical, technical training was even greater.[3]

---

[1] Jesse P. Bogue, "Universal Military Training," AAJC Washington Newsletter, II, No. 10 (August 4, 1947), 5.

[2] Jesse P. Bogue, "Education in a Changing World," Junior College Journal, XIV (September, 1943), 3-4.

[3] Jesse P. Bogue, "The Future of the Junior College," School Executive, LXVI (July, 1947), 11-13.

Bogue continued his campaign to promote the junior college as an instrument of national defense into the Cold War of the 1950's. He emphasized upon many occasions the shameful fact that two-thirds of the young men drafted for the army were rejected for physical, mental, and moral reasons; few of the rejects, Bogue added, were junior college products. He also pointed to the fact that Russia was spending much more money proportionally in their budget for education than was the United States. Most important of all, he suggested that many American youth were faltering in the ideological struggle with communism, developing a "what's the use" attitude that required immediate and effective attention. And the junior college, of course, was precisely the institution that Bogue argued could revitalize the physical, mental, and moral qualities of America's young.[1]

Bogue, like Medsker, was quick to embrace all of the new functions becoming popular in the community-junior college movement after the war. He was the first in the post-war group of national spokesmen to advance boldly and consistently the name of "community college" to characterize the new junior college seeking to provide adult education and community services in addition to multi-tracked curricula and guidance. His 1950 book entitled The Community College registered his commitment to the name while others in the movement hesitated. Although the title of "community college" had been suggested as early as 1947 by the President's Commission on Higher Education for comprehensive two-year colleges,[2] most community-junior college spokesmen did not employ the name comfortably for many years thereafter. Bogue himself sought to disassociate his book from a defense of its title, stating that he was seeking to support only the functions of such an institution and that the name itself was incidental.[1] The functions that Bogue supported were wide-ranging, as one might expect from a man influenced by a Christian missionary zeal and the need for life-adjustment curricula:

---

[1] Jesse P. Bugue, "From the Secretary's Desk," Junior College Journal, XXI (November, 1950), 152-155; and Jesse P. Bogue, "Junior Colleges and National Issues," AAJC Washington Newsletter, Vol. VI, No. 4 (December, 1950), 3.

[2] President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy; Vol. I: Establishing the Goals (6 vols.; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 67.

> By examination of life situations, of identifiable problems that need solution, on national, state and local levels, we arrive at conclusions regarding the basic functions of community colleges. They are guidance and counseling for all students and for the people of the community; general education for all students regardless of vocational objectives; technical and other vocational training, and that on a continuing basis, for students who will not advance to upper division collegiate studies; the further democratization of higher education by surmounting barriers of geography and family financial difficulties; the popularization of higher education by breaking down family traditions and creating greater personal interest and motivation; adult education and university-parallel studies for those students who should continue formal education.[2]

Certainly, listing such items as the "breaking down of family traditions" and "counseling people in the community" went beyond the stated functions for the junior college in earlier decades. But beneath the restructuring of functions into an ever great number of objectives, there remained a strong continuity with the junior college aims of the past. Basically, Bogue wanted community colleges to

> assist immeasurably in the solution of many problems of the masses. Many kinds of education are essential. For the welfare of vast numbers of students themselves, they should be channeled as far as this can be done by counseling and guidance into educational programs other than those of academic quality.[3]

---

[1] Bogue, The Community College, p. xx.

[2] Ibid., p. 76. [3] Ibid., p. 146.

Much like his predecessors in the 1920's and 1930's, Bogue felt that community-junior colleges could be instrumental in developing a class of workers and citizens, semiprofessionals, who would accept the leadership of the "professionals" and help maintain order in society. Like Eells a generation earlier, Bogue wrote of the need for educated "followship":

> Democratic co-operation means more than topflight leadership. So to speak, it also means intelligent followship. It requires understanding and appreciation of the human elements involved at all levels. Therefore, because the community college finds its greatest service in educating and training persons for the semiprofessional fields of employment, this human product stands in a highly strategic position with respect to industrial and labor relationships. These situations demand far more than technical skill.[1]

The continuing emphasis that Bogue and Medsker, and indeed all of the community-junior college national spokesmen, placed on the education of the terminal student did not mean that they were willing to abandon the traditional role of providing instruction for the preparatory student. Medsker was involved in several major studies which demonstrated that the grade point averages of junior college transfers were practically as high as native four-year college and university students. Bogue advanced the argument that the prestige of offering this collegiate instruction was important in drawing status-conscious students, or at least the children of status-conscious parents, into the institution's programs.[2] Bogue opposed the suggestion of James B. Conant in 1948 that the educational road should fork at the end of high school separating vocational and college students.[1] Argued Bogue: "Students rebel against the thought that they are entering blind alleys."[2]

---

[1] *Ibid*., p. 60.

[2] Jesse P. Bogue, "From the Executive Secretary's Desk," *Junior College Journal*, XVIII (January, 1948), 256.

Edmund J. Geazer, Jr., succeeded Bogue as Executive Director of AAJC in 1958 and still holds that position. Before his association with AAJC, Gleazer had been the president for eleven years of Graceland College in Lamoni, Iowa, a private junior college supported by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints. In 1936, Gleazer had received an A.A. degree from Graceland, and then went on to U.C.L.A. for the B.A. in 1938. As a minister in the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints, Gleazer worked in Philadelphia from 1938 to 1943, during which time he also completed work on an M.Ed. degree from Temple University. Moving to Iowa, Gleazer presided over the Eastern Iowa District of his church for three years before accepting the presidency of Graceland College in 1946. While president of Graceland College, Gleazer was able to earn an Ed.D. degree from Harvard University in 1953.[3]

Gleazer joined the AAJC staff in 1957 in an area that was vital to those concerned about the lack of public understanding of community-junior colleges--public relations. Gleazer directed a one-year Public Information Project which prepared pamphlets and news releases on the community-junior college movement and, more importantly, sought to make contacts with national industries, foundations, and news media in order to assist the movement.[4] Gleazer could be considered an image-maker, and the image he

---

[1] James Bryant Conant, *Education in a Divided World* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), p. 200.

[2] Bogue, *The Community College*, p. 33.

[3] The information in this paragraph is from *Who's Who in America*, Vol. XXXVI, 1970-1971, p. 837.

[4] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "Coats Off by the Two Year Colleges," *Junior College Journal*, XXVII (May, 1957), 515-520.

sought was one of greater prestige for the community-junior college movement.[1] Gleazer promoted community-junior colleges as "democracy's colleges" picking up in the twentieth century with the democratization of higher education where the land-grant colleges of the nineteenth century left off. He called upon junior colleges to become "openly, honestly, and gladly community colleges," democratically catering to the needs of all segments of their communities.[2]

As the official image-maker for community-junior colleges, Gleazer was even more aware than the other national spokesmen of the "identity crisis" of the institutions he represented. His concern in this regard has been mentioned earlier in this chapter. As the Public Information Project was drawing to a close, Gleazer wrote an editorial for the Junior College Journal entitled "It's Time to Ask Some Questions," in which he stated:

> . . . in the growing acceptance of the junior college there are elements of grave danger to the movement and to the needs of society it would serve unless there is also growing understanding of the values and limitations of the two-year institution.[3]

Gleazer went on to say that the continuing large numbers of students in university-parallel programs were "straws in the wind" portending future public disilusionment.[4] Junior colleges were certainly getting bigger, Gleazer pointed out, but he questioned whether they were getting any better.

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "From the Executive Directors Desk," Junior College Journal, XXIX (December, 1958), 229-231.

[2] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "From the Executive Secretary's Desk," Junior College Journal, XXXI (December 1960), 228-229.

[3] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "It's Time to Ask Some Questions," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (November, 1957), 123.

[4] Ibid.

Demonstrating the same concern for clarifying objectives that Reynolds and Medsker wrote about, Gleazer told AAJC members, upon the occasion of turning over his presidential gavel and accepting the Executive Secretary's position, that they should seek a realistic identity separate from that of high schools and senior colleges:

> The junior college is not the penthouse for the high school nor the first two floors of the senior institution. It is an identifiable educational experience with distinct qualities and characteristics.[1]

Gleazer's own attempt to identify the unique "qualities and characteristics" of the junior college led him down the same path taken by most other community-junior college national spokesmen: the path to the "community college." Accepting few limitations, and thus contradicting some of his own advice, Gleazer defended with unequaled enthusiasm the expanding list of community-junior college functions, including more vocational curricula, more community service programs, more effective guidance, more remedial programs, more recruiting of students, and so on. His book on the community-junior college movement, This Is the Community College, was a forthright statement that the multi-purpose community college was the flower of the community-junior college movement.[2] For the Executive Secretary of an organization that included numerous private two-year colleges and special-purpose institutions, Gleazer's open admiration of the community college was beyond the duty of his position.[3] But Gleazer's commitment to the "community college" was less of a commitment to any institution than it was to an idea, one he hoped would provide a new understanding, both within and without the community-junior college movement. Like most of the other community-junior college national spokesmen, Gleazer ended his search for a clearer identity with a new name--the community college--and a long list of equally vital functions. In the past few years, Gleazer has argued that the "identity crisis" of the community-junior college has passed and that the movement faces new problems. His ideas in this regard will be discussed later in Chapter V.

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "The Junior College--Bigger! Better?," Junior College Journal, XXVIII (May, 1958), 486.

[2] Gleazer, This Is the Community College, p. 5.

[3] It should be noted, however, that even in This Is the Community College Gleazer generally referred to "two-year colleges" rather than "community colleges." He also stated quite clearly his belief that private junior colleges were an important part of American education.

S. V. Martorana has been much more active as an administrator in the community-junior college movement than as an "idea man." His substantial number of publications arise mainly from reports on legislation and patterns of community-junior college governance, most of which make no attempt to define what the role of the community-junior college should be. Martorana received both his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Chicago, in 1946 and 1948 respectively. From 1949 to 1953 he was a professor of education and junior college consultant at the State College of Washington. He then moved to the Ferris Institute at Big Rapids, Michigan, where he was Dean of the General College and Pre-Professional Division from 1953 to 1955. In 1955 Martorana joined the staff of the U.S. Office of Education where he worked two years as the junior college specialist and six years more heading the office dealing with state and regional higher educational organizations. In 1963 Martorana went to the state of New York to head their higher education planning office where he worked for two years before taking his present position, that of Executive Dean for Two-Year Colleges for the State University of New York.[1]

---

[1] The data in this paragraph on Martorana are from Who's Who in American Education, Vol. I of 1967-1968 Edition: General Education, Vol. XXIII, p. 551.

Martorana did express some ideas on the proper direction of the community-junior college movement during his brief professorial career in the late 1940's. In the fashion of Koos, under whom he had studied at the University of Chicago, Martorana reported a study that he had made of course offerings listed in 410 junior college catalogues. Focusing on the extent of functional "family-life adjustment" courses available, Martorana found that only 24 percent of the colleges offered such courses, many of which he judged to be weak in content.[1] From this interest in life-adjustment courses, Martorana next published an article in defense of the community college concept.[2] The two interests were actually closely related. The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education in 1947, which recommended the use of "community college" as a new name for junior, public, comprehensive colleges, and from which Martorana liberally quoted, inserted a large dose of life-adjustment education into their promotion of community colleges.[3] Martorana also recognized the need to publicize the new community college image; he stated that it "must be introduced, nurtured, and fully developed in the minds of laymen as well as local school personnel."[4] Earlier than most other community-junior college spokesmen, Martorana saw "public relations" as the solution for the movement's "identity crisis."

When Martorana served in the U.S. Office of Education he began to write about community-junior colleges from a perspective much like one earlier expressed by U.S. Commissioner of Education George F. Zook. This perspective was a wide one, encompassing all of higher education, and viewing the community-junior college largely as a screening institution for already crowded four-year colleges and universities. In 1956 Martorana wrote:

---

[1] S. V. Martorana, "Functional Family-Life Education in Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, XIX (October, 1948), 79-88.

[2] S. V. Martorana, "Integrating the College and Community," Junior College Journal, XIX (February, 1949), 309-310.

[3] Ibid., p. 309; President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy.

[4] Martorana, "Integrating College and Community," p. 310.

> . . . the community or junior college serves as a screening institution for students on their way to advanced collegiate studies. It presents a serious challenge to the guidance and selection functions of junior colleges, one which all of us who are active in junior-college educational efforts recognize and accept. If the job is well done, it will do much to assist the universities in meeting the challenge of increasing enrollments, without sacrifice in the quality of the programs they offer.[1]

Johnson, Reynolds, Medsker, Colvert, Bogue, Gleazer, and Martorana represent a type of community-junior college spokesmen quite different from that of the previous generation. The younger spokesmen were more accepting of a variety of community-junior college purposes--some would say too accepting. The single-minded effort to promote terminal education which was characteristic of the 1920's and 1930's did not disappear in the writings of the recent spokesmen by any means, but it was diluted somewhat in a sea of other program proposals. Perhaps this is why the contemporary community-junior college spokesmen, while offering dozens of reasons for the movement's being, were troubled by being unable to explain _the_ reason for the movement's being.

Continuing Voices from the Past

Several of the community-junior college national spokesmen considered at length in the last chapter continued to be active proponents of the movement after World War Two. Since their careers were traced earlier and since many of their prime ideas had been fully developed during the 1920's and 1930's, their continuing involvement in the community-junior college movement will be briefly covered here.

---

[1] S. V. Martorana, "Reorganization in Higher Education," _Journal of Higher Education_, XXVII (December, 1956), 472.

In 1946, at age sixty-five, Leonard V. Koos retired from the University of Chicago. At the same time he began a three-year editorship of the Junior College Journal. He has continued to the present day, in his 90th year, to write and teach about the community-junior college. Although Koos has kept abreast of modern developments in the community-junior college movement, he has not felt it necessary to alter many of his ideas from the 1920's and 1930's. In his most recent work, Koos has stated that most of the functions being mentioned in such detail by present writers have actually been long established in the movement. Stated Koos:

> . . . Current formulations seldom depart from inclusion of general education, terminal occupational education, preparation for further education or the "transfer" function, adult education, and community service. To assure realization of these purposes, the formulations also include reference to guidance and remediation.
>
> . . . .
>
> The purposes are noteworthy . . . because writers on the institution have been in practically full agreement on them since the early years of the movement.[1]

While Koos did not object to the proliferation of community-junior college functions, seeing them as re-categorizations rather than alterations, he did not fall error to the conception that all stated purposes were equally important. He continued to plug his old favorites, particularly linking the community-junior college with the high school. If this was not to be done by the 6-4-4 plan, as Koos finally accepted it would not be, then at least the importance of some strong relationship, thought Koos, should be accepted. To the charge that community-junior colleges were only "glorified high schools," Koos retorted that as "people's colleges" they did in fact have many good and glorious things in common with high schools. To the problem of articulation with senior colleges, Koos added that the problem was probably more serious in relation to high schools. In discussions of the college student, Koos was always anxious to point out the problems of later adolescence which were characteristic of both high school and community-junior college students.[1]

---

[1] Koos, The Community College Student, p. 494.

Above all, Koos never lost sight of the key importance of "terminal education." In joining the chorus in support of general education at the end of World War Two, Koos noted that the widespread concern was with terminal general education, and thus was not greatly different from terminal vocational education advocated in the 1920's and 1930's.[2]

Walter Crosby Eells also continued his dedication to terminal community-junior college education into the 1940's and 1950's. In particular, Eells was an active fighter during World War Two for increased terminal education, both vocational and general. He felt the military need for trained technicians and loyal citizens added increased justification for such terminal programs. Eells, as Executive Secretary of AAJC during the war, sent out a series of Wartime Letters to the membership appraising them of developments of interest. He told of visits to capitol hill to lobby for more training contracts from the Army and Navy (Only five percent of junior colleges were so favored in 1943).[1] As Bogue was to do later, Eells went to the Capitol several times to protest proposals for universal military training.[2]

---

[1] See the following articles by Koos: "Points of Needed Curriculum Development," Junior College Journal, XVI (May, 1946), 401-410; "Rise of the People's College," School Review, LV (March, 1947), 139-149; "Is the Junior College Secondary or Higher Education?," Junior College Journal, XVIII (November, 1947), 113-114; and "The Community College as a 'Glorified High School,'" Junior College Journal, XIX (April, 1949), 429-430. Koos' recent book, The Community College Student, emphasizes the adolescent characteristics of community-junior college students.

[2] Koos, "The Rise of the People's College," p. 142.

Eells would probably have continued to be a strong voice in the community-junior college movement after World War Two had not his resignation as Executive Secretary of AAJC, forced by internal opposition, embittered him toward the junior college organization and many of the leading spokesmen in the movement. While Executive Secretary, Eells had been successful in converting his position from a half-time to a full-time basis and opening an office in Washington, D.C. The grant from the General Education Board for Terminal Education Study helped to finance these changes. By 1942, as the General Education Board grant was being depleted, the problem of meeting operational costs became acute. Many individuals in AAJC, particularly those who felt that Eells was too authoritarian and aggressive, argued that Eells and the Washington office should go, and that the Association office should return to a university campus where it might enjoy financial assistance and political isolation. The Executive Committee of AAJC voted to do this very thing upon the recommendation of AAJC President John W. Harbeson in November, 1942. Eells, uninformed of the impending move, offered his resignation as soon as he heard of the decision. Privately, Eells blamed an opposition ring including Harbeson, Medsker, and Koos, whom he charged were conspiring to move the AAJC office to the University of Chicago. Eells suspected that Robert M. Hutchins, whom he felt wanted to have some control over the direction of the junior college movement, was supporting the uprising in AAJC ranks. Faced with Eells' absolute opposition, the AAJC Board of Directors rescinded their decision. But the following two years were filled with charges and countercharges, and when Eells resubmitted his resignation in reaction to increased criticisms in the spring of 1945, it was accepted by the Board.[1]

---

[1] Walter Crosby Eells, Wartime Letter No. 29, December 22, 1943.

[2] Walter Crosby Eells, Wartime Letter No. 52, March 30, 1945.

The remainder of Eells' career in the community-junior college movement was directed toward the development of two-year colleges in foreign countries, particularly Japan. From 1945 to 1947 he headed the Foreign Education Division of the Veterans Administration, and from 1947 to 1951 he served as the adviser on higher education on the staff of the Supreme Commander of Allied Powers in Japan. Then until his death in 1963, Eells did occasional consulting and teaching in both the United States and Japan. But although Eells kept his interest in the community-junior college after his 1945 resignation from AAJC, he never attended any meetings of AAJC nor involved himself in any direct way with the movement in America.[2]

After Doak S. Campbell accepted the position of Dean of Peabody College's Graduate School in 1938 and resigned as AAJC Executive Secretary, he had limited involvement with the community-junior college movement. He did accept the chairmanship of the AAJC Commission on Junior College Terminal Education in 1939, however, which undertook the Terminal Education Study with funds that Campbell helped to procure from the General Education Board. He remained as chairman of the Commission until the conclusion of the study in 1946. Meanwhile Campbell left Peabody in 1941 to head Florida State College for Women, which became Florida State University at Tallahassee in 1957, and he remained there until his retirement in 1957. Since his retirement, Campbell has continued to be active as an educational consultant, particularly at Baptist institutions. Campbell's involvement in the community-junior college movement after 1946 was very slight.

---

[1] This account of Eells' resignation, including the citing of private correspondence, comes from Brick, Forum and Focus, pp. 42-46.

[2] Ibid., p. 46; Who Was Who in America, Vol. IV: 1961-1968, p. 281.

It might be of some value, however, to look briefly at some of the general educational and social ideas expressed by Campbell during his days as a university president. For one reason, Campbell wrote so little before the war that not much can be said about his ideological stance during that time, a fact that was pointed out in Chapter III. For another reason, Campbell, while no longer a national spokesman for community-junior colleges, did play an important role in the shaping of higher education in Florida, a state that made a major commitment to the community-junior college development in the 1950's. Furthermore, as a man instrumental in helping to establish the Southern Regional Education Board in 1949, and one who served on its executive committee for eight years, Campbell extended his influence throughout the South.[1] Since a volume of selected speeches that Campbell made in the 1940's and 1950's has been published, a record of his ideas exist for that period in his career.[2]

During World War Two, while he still chaired the Terminal Education Study, Campbell delivered an address to graduating students at Stetson University entitled "According to the Measure of a Man." In the speech Campbell spoke of the coming need for well-trained leaders to face postwar confusion:

> Those of us who are especially interested in the power and importance of trained, intelligent, and consecrated leadership,

---

[1] Fawcett, "Doak S. Campbell," 185-187.

[2] Doak S. Campbell, Southern Educator: Selected Addresses, Florida State University Studies No. 25 (Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1957).

> must be concerned with the problems and condition which will tend to engulf us in a flood of post-war confusion.[1]

A well-trained elite would not be enough to prevent confusion in the masses, however. To stress the importance of education, Campbell quoted from John Ruskin, the ninteenth century English author, on the fact that good education would curb the meaner instincts of human nature and govern proper behavior:

> "Educate, or govern, they are one and the same word. Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know. It means teaching them to behave as they do not behave."[2]

Campbell carried his message of the need for moral education into the Cold War years. Addressing a Florida State P.T.A. meeting in 1949, Campbell built his speech around an ancient proverb: "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." Campbell advised the delegates that they should not be concerned about training as "indoctrination" as long as its goals were right. Drawing a lesson from Nazi Germany, Campbell stated:

> We have seen in our own lifetime the example of a whole nation of youth who were trained up in the way the dictator said they should go. This teaches us, at least, that it can be done effectively.

The difference in a free nation, Campbell went on to say, was that all of society would determine "the way in which the child should go." While Campbell did not pretend that this would be an easy task, he did suggest that there were at least three virtues that everyone could agree upon: (1) A positive attitude toward hard work which would inspire "a full day's work for a full day's pay" (Campbell pointed to increasing welfare rolls in support of this need); (3) Frugality; and (3) Self-denial.[1] Campbell had similar advice for teachers in Florida in a 1952 address:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 22.

[2] Ibid., p. 26; the same quotation can be found in a 1943 speech by Campbell entitled "Attitudes for Responsive and Responsible Citizenship," Ibid., p. 46. Campbell gave a special warning to junior colleges to guard against moral decay and a disrespect for constituted authority after the way by teaching values more effectively. See Doak S. Campbell, "Junior Colleges and Defense--Today and Tomorrow," Junior College Journal, XI (March, 1941), 363-364.

> Some teachers have been victimized by an oversimplification of such terms as democracy, tolerance, indoctrination and the like. They have been told that in a democracy there must be no indoctrination; that it is wrong or "undemocratic" to influence the attitude of others through the process of teaching. Since when was it wrong to use every legitimate means to teach children to be honest; to recognize and respect the rights of others; to abhor sin and love righteousness? As I interpret the American ideal, religion, morality, and knowledge--all three compose the great trinity of education.[2]

These ideas expressed by Campbell in the 1940's and 1950's are perfectly consistent with those expressed by his associates in defense of terminal education in the 1920's and 1930's. But Campbell's ideas appear to be different because they were usually tied to the theme of national defense. World War Two and the Cold War provided a backdrop which pictured the type of citizenship training advocated by Campbell as necessary for survival. Before World War Two, a similar type of citizenship training--terminal education--was advocated by other spokesmen for the community-junior college, not for survival but for the perfection of American society. In either case, a structured society with loyal and conforming masses of people was considered an important goal.

John W. Harbeson was a particularly active community-junior college leader during World War Two. He was president of AAJC for the 1942-1943 term, and in this position began the campaign which resulted in the ousting of Eells as Executive Secretary. He also served during the war as chairman of AAJC's Committee on Wartime Activities. Harbeson publicized the role that community-junior colleges could play in the war by providing welders, riveters, lathe workers, machine operators, etc., for war industries.[1]

---

[1] All of the quoted and paraphrased material from the P.T.A. speech in this paragraph is from Campbell, Southern Educator, pp. 91-94.

[2] Cited from among Campbell's personal papers by Fawcett, "Doak S. Campbell," p. 48.

"Important as these services are, however," Harbeson went on to say:

> they do not constitute the major responsibilities of the junior college in the present emergency. The primary and undisputable function of the junior college is now, as it always has been and perennially will remain, to train students comprehensively for the solution of life's problems.[2]

As Harbeson went on to explain the type of "life-training" he advocated, he sounded much like Jesse P. Bogue. He had in mind men who respected authority and would do right, men who would curtail their individual foibles for the sake of an orderly, efficient society. The law itself, Harbeson feared, sanctioned individual liberty at the expense of society:

> Too often . . . we of past generations have condoned antisocial conduct by a legalistic interpretation of objective authority. We must create a generation of men who will judge human conduct solely on the basis of social consequences following the wake of their actions.[3]

"Guided by our intelligence," Harbeson said in an article written on the same topic a half-year later, "we shall make no serious mistakes."[4]

Harbeson was the first community-junior college national spokesman in this study to recommend to his colleagues that they adopt the name "community college." The war, which brought a large number of adults into the junior colleges, made the connection between "terminal education" and "adolescence" less tenable. These older concepts, argued Harbeson, were all tied to the "junior college," and the name should be changed to project an image that terminal programs were also good for adults. Harbeson suggested the name of the "community college" first in 1944, but at that time he also thought that "city college," a name used in Los Angeles, or just "college" would suffice.[1] In 1949 he presented another case for the "community college" name, this time based on the increasingly common argument that the expanding functions of community service, vocational-technical curricula, as well as adult education deserve to be packaged in a new wrapping.[2]

---

[1] John W. Harbeson, "The Junior College in the Present Emergency," Junior College Journal, XII (April, 1942), 435.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., p. 436.

[4] John W. Harbeson, "Junior Colleges and Total War," Junior College Journal, XIII (October, 1942), 69.

Along with ideas that he generated in the 1940's, Harbeson also mixed in some of his old concepts. He kept pushing for the 6-4-4 plan after many of its other advocates abandoned it.[3] He continued to publicize the need to train the masses to be good citizens, only changing the name of this function from "terminal education" to "general education" after World War Two. Such training, argued Harbeson, should provide "an efficient present and future functioning" in five areas of "human need"--personal, physical and mental, socio-civic, home-life, and vocational areas.[4] The writings of Harbeson show clearly the effortless transformation in the focus of the community-junior college ideology from the junior to the community college. a shift that occasioned little debate because it involved little change.

---

[1] John W. Harbeson, "The Rechristening of the Junior Colleges," California Journal of Secondary Education, XIX (April, 1944), 204-207.

[2] John W. Harbeson, "The Community College," NEA Journal, XXXVIII (October, 1949), 502-503.

[3] See Sexson and Harbeson, The New American College; John W. Harbeson, "Evaluating the 6-4-4 Plan," National Association of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXII (March, 1948), 143-151.

[4] John W. Harbeson, "Curriculum for Human Need," Educational Leadership, IV (December, 1946), 194-195.

Nicholas Ricciardi, James M. Wood, and George F. Zook had little to say about the community-junior college movement after the 1930's; accordingly, scant attention will be given to them here. Ricciardi wrote in 1947 about his concern that technical-institutes were not doing enough to promote "social efficiency." Wood shifted his concern to private junior colleges, citing their ability to carry out progressive and personal education. After Wood's retirement from Stephens College in 1947, he stopped writing about the movement at all. Zook, who always viewed the community-junior college from a "university perspective," continued to advise junior colleges to attend more to non-academic instruction and to steer more students away from college preparatory programs.[1] Left to be mentioned during this era is Robert M. Hutchins. Perhaps he too, if measured in terms of his contribution to the community-junior college ideology, should receive only brief mention. But for the sake of the illumination that his ideas can provide in understanding the community-junior college ideology, they are well worth careful study.

Hutchins' departure from the University of Chicago in 1951, welcomed by both Hutchins and the University's faculty, was discussed in the last chapter. His subsequent positions with the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic did not at all prevent him from writing his ideas about

---

[1] Nicholas Ricciardi, "Accrediting Curricula of Technical-Institute Type," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXII (March, 1947), 166-169; James M. Wood, "What the Private Junior College Has to Offer," Nation's Schools, XXXV (April, 1945), 31; George F. Zook, "Changing Patterns of Junior College Education," Junior College Journal, XVI (May, 1946), 411-417; George F. Zook, "Education--What For?," Junior College Journal, XX (May, 1950), 523-530.

American education, including his ideas on the community-junior college. Even before he left Chicago, Hutchins served notice that his interest in the community-junior college was based on what it could be rather than what it was. This was obvious when Hutchins launched a broadside attack upon the 1947 report of the President's Commission on Higher Education which had urged the development of "community colleges" with virtually limitless functions. To Hutchins, ever the foe of vocationalism and non-intellectual college curricula, the report represented everything wrong with American education. He called the report "antihumanistic and anti-intellectual," "a Fourth-of July oration in pedaguese." He labeled the report's contention that education can and should do everything the "omnibus fallacy" which "diverts the public mind from direct attack on the evil under consideration by proposing the easy, if costly, alternative, 'Let education do it.'" Inequities in the economic system and in birth rates, argued Hutchins, can be solved by better means than education. Not only had the Commission backed vocational education to the detriment of general education, according to Hutchins, but its anti-intellectual flavor was bound to keep American education a "gigantic playroom, designed to keep the young out of worse places until they can go to work."[1] Since everyone of the other subjects in this study cheered the report of the President's Commission, it is no wonder that "Quotations from President Hutchins" suddenly disappeared from the pages of the Junior College Journal.

A particularly perceptive observation by Hutchins, at least as far as it applies to the community-junior college movement, concerned the relationship between life-adjustment education and public relations, for most community-junior college national spokesmen championed both. Hutchins focused attention upon the most overworked word in the life-adjustment vocabulary: needs.

---

[1] Robert M. Hutchins, "The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education," Educational Record, XXIX (April, 1948), 107-122.

> How do you know a need when you see one? The usual answer is that you know one by the demand. And the next step is to enlarge your market by the best advertising and sales techniques, through creating a demand for something you could offer to supply.
>
> . . . .
>
> The doctrine of needs thus ends in public relations. I think it fair to say that the dominant concern of school superintendents and university presidents in America is public relations.[1]

Any community-junior college national spokesman reading Hutchins perceptively would have to have been somewhat sensitive to his own movement's extensive use of "needs" in their rhetoric. And many would have been equally sensitive to Hutchins' comments on public relations, since many voices in the movement were calling for better public relations as an answer to the movement's "identity crisis." It would have taken a particularly astute member of the community-junior college movement to have detected in Hutchins' writing the fact that a lack of values, ideals, and ideology was the root of their confusion. But Hutchins said it plainly: "The loss of an intelligible and attainable ideal lies at the root of the troubles of American education."[2]

As if to make his separation with the community-junior college movement formal and complete, Hutchins shot barbs especially aimed at the concept of the "community college" in 1964:

> While nobody was looking, the junior college, which might have become the home of liberal education, became the community

---

[1] Robert M. Hutchins, The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), pp. 30-31.

[2] Robert M. Hutchins, Some Observations on American Education (London: Cambridge University Press, 1956), p. 31.

> college, the reflection of community pressures, and a place of accommodation for those who did not know what else to do.[1]

The selected themes which follow will help to summarize some of the key ideas of the contemporary community-junior college national spokesmen already discussed, but several points should already be clear. First, the spokesmen sensed and were greatly concerned that they were not being properly understood by the public, in spite of the high degree of acceptance given to whatever the public thought the community-junior college actually was. Secondly, with only a few expressed reservations, the spokesmen were eager to promote any number of new educational and social functions, usually championed under the banner of the "community college." The more educational and social functions that were introduced, however, the more concerned the spokesmen seemed to be that their "real identity" was being confused. Finally, the spokesmen continued to stress the role of the community-junior college in training the masses of citizens, not only for jobs but also for a responsible place in American society. They never felt easy about the large number of students aspiring to a university education whom they were certain should not, and probably would not, continue their education beyond the community-junior college.

The Impact of World War Two and the Cold War

Much has already been said in this chapter about the ideas generated by World War Two in the minds of the community-junior college national spokesmen. It was no coincidence that the resurgence of interest in general education came during and immediately after that war. The report of

---

[1] Robert M. Hutchins, "The Time is Now," Liberal Education: Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, L (May, 1964), 255-256.

The Harvard Committee on General Education in 1945 attracted national attention.[1] Within the community-junior college movement the studies by Johnson and by Reynolds mentioned earlier were symptomatic of the popularity of general education. Perhaps it could be that the nation's second confrontation with German efficiency, with the particular perversion of order and social unity apparent in Nazism, served as a harsh reminder that the development of the individual needed attention too. Or perhaps the very contest between super-efficient powers called for a type of civic education insuring even a greater amount of mass conformity, which was advocated under the euphemism of "general education." Neither of these radically different theses can be wholly supported nor wholly disputed by the meaning that general education held for the spokesmen of the community-junior college movement during this period.

Medsker, it will be remembered, was an advocate of greater industrial training in 1939 but emerged during and after the war as also a special friend of general education. His work with the Terminal Education Study could very well be responsible for this widened perspective, but also the war could have been responsible. Recognizing a national need for unity which surpassed industry's need for workers, Medsker urged the government to turn to the junior college during the war for manpower and, if need be, to promote uniformity:

> Out of its well-established existence has come experience and ability to deal with all types of students regardless of ability, background, or educational and vocational ambitions. Because of these factors the 600 junior colleges, in addition to others likely to be organized, could become centers for the rehabilitation of youth, the extension of general and vocational education, the provision of

---

[1] General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945).

> try-out and exploratory work, and the utilization of an effective guidance program. Even if it should be considered necessary to have some degree of uniformity for the country, much could be gained by using these existing institutions and assigning to them the task they are best able to do--that of effectively training and guiding young people.[1]

Two of the most active community-junior college national spokesmen during the war were Harbeson and Eells. Harbeson's conviction that the war demonstrated even a greater need for citizenship training than for training technicians has been noted earlier. Eells concurred that the development of the right kind of person was far more important than developing mere skills:

> Perhaps the war has served . . . to emphasize as never before the fundamental importance of what we have for decades been accustomed to call the "liberal arts." The pressing call from both army and navy to our colleges is not primarily for men with exclusively technical training, but for the development of men of dynamic personality, of general competence, of potential leadership. With these qualities as a basis, the armed services say they can quickly give the specialized and technical training to develop competent officers. Without these basic qualities, however, specialized and technical training is wasted or ineffective.[2]

Writers on the community-junior college have generally emphasized the importance of World War Two in developing programs of a vocational and technical nature in community-junior colleges, but there was no wholesale shift in the ideology of the movement toward technical training over general education.[3] If any shift at all occurred in the placement of values regarding general and technical training, it was slightly in the direction of general education.

---

[1] Medsker, "The Wartime Role of Our Junior Colleges," p. 39.

[2] Eells, "Developments in Higher Education--Wise and Otherwise," p. 466.

[3] See Blocker, Plummer and Richardson, The Two Year College, p. 30, and Brick, Forum and Focus, p. 28, for the standard interpretation. The actual extent to which technical-vocational programs increased in community-junior colleges during the war is a subject that needs more study. In the literature of the movement, the fact that 5,000 civilian pilots were trained in community-junior colleges is frequently mentioned, but only general references to training other war-related skills are made. Eells complained during the war that the government was not using community-junior colleges

After the war, with the nation confronting a new enemy--the Soviet Union--whose ideology seemed to pose a greater immediate threat than its armies, the need for solid citizenship training appeared greater than ever in the community-junior college ideology. A 1946 resolution by the AAJC membership supported the idea of seeking federal aid for funds to help the junior colleges to teach effectively democratic values for the benefit of individual student development and national defense.[1] When Bogue took this resolution to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he warned that if Congress did not help finance community-junior colleges in poor states it would "create a pool of human beings unfit by mental and physical standards to defend the nation in a time of crisis." As a secondary argument, Bogue inserted the economic benefits which would accrue to the nation from an expanded system of community-junior colleges.[2]

The lack of common values in society, which was threatening enough to the community-junior college spokesmen during times of peace, appeared to be an even greater danger in times of international conflict. Medsker related the internal and external threat of social disintegration during the Korean War thusly:

> Sociologists tell us of our constantly changing value systems, the frustrations, the loneliness, and the confusion of a people

---

as much as they should, and there was over a 50 percent decline in community-junior college enrollment during the war. Perhaps the actual change in community-junior college programs during the war was not much greater than the minor changes in the movement's ideology.

[1] Jesse P. Bogue, "Your Nation's Capitol and Your Junior College," AAJC Washington Newsletter, Vol. II, No. 7 (April 30, 1947), 1.

[2] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

> now without a frontier, highly urbanized, and dependent on vicarious experiences for the formulation of their ideas and judgments. That all this should be true at the very time that the pressure of communism should rise to its present height may be more than a coincidence and it surely leaves democracy with less strength with which to preserve itself.[1]

What did Medsker mean by stating that the relationship between changing value systems and the rise of communism "may be more than a coincidence"? He went on to say that he did not want to sanction "witch-hunting" that confused communism with social progress, so apparently he was not referring to the same relationship perceived at that time by Senator Joseph McCarthy. It is not clear in the article what prompted this suggestion, but Medsker's defense of general education, particularly to teach youth to stabilize their emotions and to look at the world "realistically," made it clear that he thought general education was necessary to defend against internal disintegration as well as external aggression.[2]

Doak S. Campbell was less cautious than Medsker in viewing education as a method of promoting patriotism and anti-communism. In a 1950 speech before the Mississippi Educational Association he stated:

> I feel certain of one important necessity. This necessity is all the more acute so far as the junior college is concerned because this institution lies so close to the American people. I refer to protection of the American ideals in the minds and the lives of this generation of growing Americans. . . .
>
> The difficulty of teaching true Americanism under present day conditions is far greater than ever before. The hazards of developing the degree of intelligence and at the same time the degree of patriotic fervor necessary to maintain this nation constitute a challenge the like of which we have never met in this nation.[3]

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker, "Junior Colleges in This Period of Crisis," Junior College Journal, XXIII (January, 1952), 251.

[2] *Ibid*., pp. 253-256.

[3] Quoted in Fawcett, "Doak S. Campbell," p. 90.

Referring without qualification to a communist conspiracy to disorient the nation, Campbell warned at the Freshmen Convocation at Florida State University in 1950 that an objective of communism was:

> to make us dissatisfied, to confuse us, to increase our taxes so that we shall be more heavily burdened, to dangle before us ideas which theoretically seem to show us an easy way out of difficulty.[1]

Campbell specified the junior college as a basic institution for indoctrination, a term he did not hesitate to use. It was, as he said, an institution "close to the American people." As an instructor of the masses, it could guard against un-American ideas.

Shortly after the outbreak of the Korean War, James W. Reynolds, then editor of the Junior College Journal, was invited to a meeting with other representatives from higher education and with representatives of the federal government to discuss how colleges and universities could be most effectively utilized in the crisis. Reynolds reported in the Journal that two responsibilities were mentioned repeatedly:

> (1) scientific and technical education, and (2) education in the ideals of democracy. The second of these two responsibilities . . . deserves even more emphasis than has been given.[2]

Adapting the earlier arguments for semiprofessional education to the Korean War, Bogue recommended that junior colleges run summer camps for high school graduates who volunteer for military service. At the summer camps, the young men could be screened, and those who looked like promising prospects for high-ranking, non-commissioned officer positions would be sent on, perhaps on scholarships, to junior colleges and technical institutes.[3] It is interesting that Bogue's proposal, never accepted by the government, which would have established an R.O.T.C. program of sorts in junior colleges, was geared to train men for intermediate positions, between the officers (who would ordinarily be university men) and the enlisted men (drawn from the masses). It was a military role corresponding exactly to the civilian role that Bogue and others had envisioned for "terminal" junior college graduates for many years.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 195-196.

[2] James W. Reynolds, "Maintaining Equilibrium in the Junior College," Junior College Journal, XXI (November, 1950), 123.

[3] Jesse P. Bogue, "From the Executive Secretary's Desk," Junior College Journal, XXI (September, 1950), 50-51.

The 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education, which had recommended the name of the "community college," also struck a responsive chord among community-junior college national spokesmen in its emphasis on general education. The Commission viewed general education much as the community-junior college spokesmen did, as a deterrent to social disintegration and as a promoter of unity:

> The failure to provide any core of unity in the essential diversity of higher education is a cause for grave concern. A society whose members lack a body of common experience and common knowledge is a society without a fundamental culture; it tends to disintegrate into a mere aggregation of individuals. Some community of values, ideas, and attitudes is essential as a cohesive force in this age of minute division of labor and intense conflict of special interests.
>
> The crucial task of higher education today, therefore, is to provide a unified general education for American youth. Colleges must find the right relationship between specialized training on the one hand, aiming at a thousand different careers, and the transmission of a common cultural heritage toward a common citizenship on the other.[1]

Even Robert M. Hutchins, who furiously attacked the Commission's report, might have agreed with this statement on general education. But the educational programs recommended by the Commission in the name of general education were the opposite of Hutchins' plan; they were instead the type that community-junior colleges promoted--functional, practical, behaviorally-oriented programs, the type of general education underwritten by B. Lamar Johnson's General Education in Action.

---

[1] President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education in American Democracy, Vol. I: Establishing the Goals, pp. 48-49.

Of the three types of general education identified by Russell Thomas which were discussed in the previous chapter--knowledge-centered, problem-centered, and behavior-centered, the type which appealed most to the community-junior college national spokesmen was the latter. This, of course, was unacceptable to Hutchins who decried the anti-intellectualism of the approach. The inventor of the categories, Russell Thomas, viewed the problem-solving approach most favorably. In his project for the Carnegie Corporation in the 1950's to identify vital centers of general education programs, Thomas selected eighteen colleges and universities as key models--not one was a community-junior college.[1] All the same, regardless of the sentiments of Hutchins and Thomas, a campaign for general education was underway in the late 1940's and early 1950's, an ideological campaign if not an institutional campaign, which focused on the proper values and behaviors of citizens and of which community-junior college national spokesmen were very much a part. The campaign, as far as community-junior college ideology was concerned, was actually as old as the movement itself. A world in international conflict, however, added to it a new sense of urgency and importance.

Ideas and Efforts Toward Vocational-Technical Education

Ever since the 1920's, the community-junior college ideology has contained an element of support for specialized education leading to jobs. The idea, however, has always been more apparent in the ideology than in institutional offerings of specific vocational-technical (or semiprofessional, to use the term generally employed in the 1920's and 1930's) programs. The long-standing discrepancy between the idea and the reality is usually explained by the following reasons: (1) the great expense of occupational curricula; (2) the difficulty in recruiting competent teachers; (3) the lack of information on programs available to students; and (4) the prestige factor which causes students to enroll in transfer programs.[1] Completely overlooked is the fact that the community-junior college ideology itself has historically subordinated the idea of job training to the idea of citizenship training. Even contemporary spokesmen for the community-junior college movement who speak out strongly in support of more vocational-technical programs seldom make their case without indicating a stronger allegiance to the idea that the community-junior college cannot permit its students to leave its programs without adequate "general education."

---

[1] Russell Thomas, The Search for a Common Learning, pp. 107-276.

World War Two did give a boost to the idea of vocational-training, although, as mentioned earlier, the boost to the idea of citizenship training was even greater. The presence of adults in community-junior colleges during the war and the influx of veterans after the war (slow at first, but accounting for about 40 percent of the 1947 enrollment) presented the community-junior colleges with a large group of practically-minded students. They were job-oriented, although many had vocations in mind that required a bachelor's degree. The rise of the "community college," as an ideal more than an institution, was in part a response to this development.[1] Many expected the two-year colleges to provide, efficiently and economically, for the needs of these groups, including President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

---

[1] See Grant Venn, Man, Education, and Work, pp. 88-89; Venn reported that less than 25 percent of all junior college students were enrolled in occupational programs, 1960.

> The junior college has now become a robust youngster in the family of American educational institutions. My particular interest at present centers in the part that the junior college may play in providing suitable education for many of the returning soldiers and sailors. These men and women will wish, in many cases, terminal courses which combine technical and other vocational preparation with courses which assure a basic understanding of the issues confronted by them as Americans and world citizens. It seems possible, therefore, that the junior college may furnish the answer to a good many of these needs.[2]

Vocational needs of veterans as well as other groups were widely recognized among community-junior college national spokesmen too, but in their rhetoric more than their institutions. And even in their rhetoric, close examination reveals a shallow commitment.

Jesse P. Bogue's The Community College was the major source-book on the community-junior college movement during the 1950's. In its chapter on "Technical Education in the Community College" appeared very little on the nature or scope of technical education programs.[3] That chapter did contain, however, an extended argument for the importance of general education, including the object lesson of highly skilled scientists who harbored communist leanings.[4] While Bogue did not attempt to set the proper proportions for the right balance between general and technical education, he did say:

---

[1] See S. V. Martorana, "Implications of Wartime Adjustments for Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, XVII (September, 1946), 11-17; and Leland L. Medsker, "What Do We Have in the Junior College?," Chicago Schools Journal, XXIX (September, 1947), 2-7.

[2] Contained in a letter from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Walter Crosby Eells dated January 7, 1944. Quoted in Walter Crosby Eells, Wartime Letter No. 30, January 18, 1944, p. 6.

[3] Bogue, The Community College, pp. 179-205. [4] Ibid., p. 182.

> When the question is asked as to how much general education should be included in a technical program in a community college, the answer is that there should be just as much as possible.[1]

In 1960, Medsker's book replaced Bogue's as the handbook on the community-junior college.[2] Medsker was distressed by the fact that two-thirds of the community-junior college students were in transfer programs and only one-third were in terminal programs; he felt these proportions should be reversed.[3] But one can search in vain through the pages of Medsker's book for any clear picture of what terminal curricula should be. He does state that a terminal program may be general, occupational, or a combination of the two, and he does warn against overspecialization in a technologically changing society, but he offers no specific guidelines for determining a good terminal program.[4]

A close examination of the ideas of Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., the current official spokesman for the community-junior college movement by virtue of being Executive Secretary of AAJC, reveals an interesting development in the relationship between vocational-technical and general education. In 1960 Gleazer agreed with Medsker that rapid technological change made specialized technical training of limited occupational value. More general training seemed necessary to provide a base flexible enough to allow the individual to build various sets of special skills upon it throughout his changing career. This was in addition to the idea that general learning in non-vocational areas was essential to good citizenship. Thus general education began to mean both general learning for a good life and general learning to undergird a life-time career.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[2] Medsker, *The Junior College: Progress and Prospect.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 112. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 53-55.

Gleazer explained the merger of these two types of general learning in his column in the Junior College Journal in 1960. Watching Nixon-Kennedy debates on television, explained Gleazer, sharpened his awareness of the importance of "training the critical faculties" of citizens through general education. "Fast changing technology and expensive equipment," Gleazer went on to say,

> will very likely necessitate moves in this direction anyway. Basic principles will be taught. . . . The kind of general education I envision is not something apart from the vocational programs but closely interfused.[1]

Somehow Gleazer was able to think, without being too explicit in detail, that general education as citizenship training and general education as vocational training were one and the same, or at least becoming so. When he conceived of the two types separately, he gave precedence to the idea of citizenship:

> We must keep in mind the "why" of all this. It is not our aim merely to perpetuate the junior college--not merely to prepare people for more efficient handling of their jobs. No, our eyes must be far beyond these objectives. We would prepare leaders in the world of ideas because our times require such men.[2]

By 1965, Gleazer had developed the blending of general and vocational education even further. Distinguishing "occupational preparation" from "vocational calling," Gleazer recommended that community-junior colleges concentrate on the latter:

> Vocation includes the person's activities and relationships, beyond those for which he gets financial reward. It is his reason for being, his own sense of destiny, his part in the social group, his role in the community. A democracy cannot

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "From the Executive Director's Desk," Junior College Journal, XXXI (December, 1960), 231.

[2] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "A National Approach to Junior College Leadership," Journal of Secondary Education, XXXVI (January, 1961), 64.

> endure if education limits its concern and attention to occupational preparation. It must prepare for the full vocation--the man's calling.[1]

Going on to suggest the nature of preparation for a "vocation," Gleazer showed that he subscribed to the functional, behavioral type of general education:

> What should such preparation include? Let me describe one essential element. Very frequently we hear people, both youth and adults, say: "You can't make me do that." "This is a free country." Not often enough do we hear the reply: "That's right, I can't make you do it, but keep in mind that if there are some things you want to do then there are some things you must do."[2]

Gleazer did not specify any things one "must do;" he made only the general point that a place in the occupational structure and a place in the social structure involved a total set of attitudes and behaviors which education should be concerned with shaping.

With his manner of combining general education and vocational-technical education into one conception of education for "vocations," Gleazer was less prone to view curricula as either general or occupational. In a way reminiscent of early writings in the vocational education movement that distinguished hand-minded from book-minded students, Gleazer suggested that many students should be educated for "vocations" in practical rather than theoretical ways:

> A large portion of community college students are inclined toward the practical and applied rather than the theoretical and abstract. They need a sense of contact with the "real world," not a simulated one of words and symbols. Action-oriented occupational programs with experience on the job can capture their interest whereas immersion in a highly verbal atmosphere can defeat them. This does not mean that occupational

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, "AAJC Approach: Matching Our Times," Junior College Journal, XXXV (March, 1965), 3.

[2] Ibid.

> students learn no linguistic skills or lack the ability to theorize. But in emphasis and sequence the application of knowledge and skills development comes first.[1]

Thus by transforming a commitment to general education into a commitment to education for "vocations," with a broad meaning, and then by viewing the curricula, at least for some students, as practical experience with educational value beyond mere occupational training, Gleazer appears to have developed an idea of vocational education dependent upon the idea of general education but permissive toward practical skill courses and specialized on-the-job type training.

Recent writings by community-junior college leaders show a greater concern for specialized training programs without the customary concern for general education. Since 1965, aid from foundations and the federal government has been largely directed toward such programs. The extent to which this recent change can be detected in the community-junior college ideology will be discussed further in Chapter V, but from the thinking of Gleazer alone it would seem that a transformation from general to specialized education is in the making.

Developments in Guidance

There may have been a weakening in the role played by general education in the community-junior college ideology in recent years, but not so with guidance. It has consistently remained a highly valued component of the ideology from the 1920's to the present. The belief that the community-junior college could offer programs suitable for a wide variety of groups has always been conditional upon the assumption that an effective guidance program could match a student with a program in a realistic and scientific manner.

---

[1] Gleazer, This is the Community College, p. 70.

Two salient facts underscoring the need for guidance could not be ignored by community-junior college national spokesmen in any decade since the 1920's: (1) Too many community-junior college students aspired to four-year college and university educations to acquire professional positions (positions believed to be in short supply and beyond the abilities of most students); and, as a corollary to the first point, (2) Too few students enrolled in vocational programs which were more in keeping with their abilities and the needs of society. In recent years the rhetoric has changed from "the limits of an individual's intelligence" to "individual potentials of varying types," but the positive wording has not lessened the importance of the guidance program in the selection and distribution of students.

The 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education concluded, based on a consideration of the results of the Army General Classification Test given during World War Two, that at least 49 percent of the American population had the mental ability to complete fourteen years of schooling in a curriculum of general and vocational studies leading either to gainful employment or to further study at a more advanced level. At least 32 percent of the population, the Commission estimated, had the mental ability to complete an advanced liberal or specialized professional education.[1] These figures found ready acceptance in the thinking of community-junior college national spokesmen. They seemed to confirm the appropriateness of one-third of the community-junior college student population transferring on to four-year colleges and universities and to emphasize the importance of placing the rest of the students into appropriate non-transfer curricula.

---

[1] President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy; Vol. I: Establishing the Goals, p. 41.

Jesse P. Bogue, the major figure in the community-junior college movement during most of the 1950's, argued that an extended period of education was justified solely on the basis of helping individuals find their appropriate niche in a complex society. In a democracy, stated Bogue, this placement had to be through education:

> Enlightened public opinion regarding the further extension of education justifies itself by reason of the present complexity of society. In a totalitarian society, individuals may be put in their respective places by fiat. In a democracy, men must find their places by functional methods, by education, counseling, and guidance.[1]

Men should be free to make their own decisions and to govern their own actions, Bogue believed, but he added:

> In a complex society, man's essential freedoms may remain inviolate only if he is capable of exercising them with intelligence.[2]

Education, counseling, and guidance should serve, according to Bogue, to increase the likelihood of "intelligent" decisions on life-goals by community-junior college students, decisions that take into account the limits of the individual's abilities and the needs of society. If a student remained incapable of an intelligent decision after exposure to education, counseling, and guidance, Bogue did not suggest what should be done. Presumably his freedom to choose might be forfeited.

Just as important in the community-junior college ideology as the role of guidance in directing students into appropriate programs was its role to direct many of them away from university-transfer programs. In many statements of the role of guidance, this was the first concern. This screening process was not viewed as one which denied to many students the fulfillment of their aspirations but rather as one which saved them from the brutal elimination waiting for them at the university. In 1947, Leland L. Medsker put it this way:

---

[1] Bogue, The Community College, p. 16.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.

> One of the principal advantages of the junior college is that it serves as a proving ground or screening process and that it provides a two-way outlet for all entrants without the frustration that may result when a student enters a higher institution directly and finds himself unable or unwilling to pursue its curriculum.[1]

The comfort of thinking that students were being helped and not hurt by guiding them, or attempting to guide them, into vocational curricula was pierced by a disturbing study by sociologist Burton R. Clark in 1960.[2] In a case study of San Jose Junior College in California, Clark described what he called the "cooling-out function," a process of "structured failure" which employed guidance and counseling to confront the student periodically and systematically with the record of his failures with sympathetic suggestions of alternative programs. Clark suggested quite strongly that it was not student limitations but rather limitations imposed by society, a society which felt it important to limit the "room-at-the-top," that created the need for the "cooling-out function." Furthermore, Clark stated that deception was important for the successful operation of the function, for if it were perceived and understood by prospective clientele the open doors of community-junior colleges would not be so inviting.[3]

There was surprisingly little direct reaction to Clark's disturbing study. Ironically, the term "open-door" was an overnight success in the community-junior college ideology, credit for which was given to Clark, but his ideas on the "cooling-out function" were scarcely mentioned at all. Gleazer reviewed the book in the Junior College Journal and warned the membership (the same warning issued by the Carnegie Corporation of New York) that Clark studied a single college and that his findings should not be generalized.[1] Other criticisms of Clark's work were not forthcoming, leaving one to wonder if the increased concern about how wide was the open door, which came later in the 1960's and which will be discussed in detail in Chapter V, was a delayed reaction on Clark's thesis.

---

[1] Leland L. Medsker, "What Do We Have in the Junior College?," p. 3.

[2] Burton R. Clark, The Open Door College (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960).

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 165.

That the community-junior college tended to look for weaknesses in students rather than strengths was a concern to B. Lamar Johnson before Clark's study. Out of this concern, Johnson wrote a letter to California junior college administrators in 1951 in which he stated:

> . . . our junior colleges, as well as our high schools and our senior colleges, need more teachers who are "talent scouts." Often in our schools and colleges, we identify the weaknesses of students and set up remedial programs to care for these deficiencies but fail to identify the special talents and abilities of students and fail to build programs designed to capitalize on these particular potentialities.[2]

In 1959, Johnson carried this message to a state legislative hearing in Los Angeles. Quoting John W. Gardner, then President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Johnson emphasized that the idea of excellent education for the elite and common education for the masses had passed its usefulness. In modern society, stated Johnson, education for all needed to be excellent, and the concept of excellence had to extend to various social and occupational levels, not just to the top.[1]

---

[1] Clark's book was in the Carnegie Series in American Education, as was Medsker's study published the same year. Criticisms of the book by the Carnegie Foundation are included in Gleazer's review. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "From the Executive Director's Desk," Junior College Journal, XXX (March, 1960), 416.

[2] Johnson, General Education in Action, p. 376.

Johnson's interest in developing a variety of individual potentials toward an expanded concept of excellence, however, did not prevent him from joining with other community-junior college national spokesmen in the campaign to divert the multitude from its "unrealistic" designs of achieving professional status. He deplored the "halo" placed upon university-transfer programs by social prestige, and he worried about the plans of what he estimated to be 80 to 90 percent of the school population to enter professional life, which he estimated could accommodate only five to six percent of them.[2] In the same article where he cited his defense of excellence for all before a legislative hearing, Johnson complained of the waste created by allowing students to enter programs beyond their abilities or interests:

> A problem which concerns me, and a problem which concerns you and the taxpayers of this State, is the waste of time and talent, money and facilities which is occurring as thousands of students are today enrolled in California junior college courses for which they are not qualified--sometimes by a deficiency of achievement or ability, at other times by lack of interest or goal. Not only is the time of such students themselves largely lost, but the burdens of instructors are increased and the progress of able students is often retarded.[3]

The waste of time, money, and effort resulting from unrealistic student goals, Johnson once stated, could damage the community-junior colleges' public relations, causing a loss of public confidence and support. Johnson illustrated the point as follows:

---

[1] B. Lamar Johnson, "Footnotes on Junior College Standards," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (May, 1960), 277-278.

[2] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education in the Junior College," North Central Association Quarterly, XXIV (April, 1950), 360-361.

[3] Johnson, "General Education in the Junior College," p. 280.

> A prominent layman expressed one of several points of view when he said, "If your college doesn't get students into a proper slot, you're wasting your time, their time, and a lot of the taxpayer's money." A biased and naive view, perhaps, but significant nonetheless.[1]

To guard against waste, to deter unqualified students from the university-transfer programs, and to guide students into programs where they could achieve "excellence" in line with their own "potential," Johnson, like the other community-junior college national spokesmen, looked to the guidance and counseling program.[2]

Whether to screen students, to distribute students, or to match students with programs in keeping with their limitations or their potentials, the guidance and counseling function of the community-junior college was heralded by all spokesmen for the movement as the key to success. No part of the community-junior college ideology has been so consistently championed or so little changed throughout the history of the movement.

Where is the "Community College?"

If the name "junior college" is appropriate for two-year colleges primarily concerned with transferring suitable students on to other higher institutions, and if the name "community college" is appropriate for two-year colleges primarily concerned with providing a wide range of programs geared to serve various groups in the community, then the present tendency to adopt the "community college" trade-mark in two-year colleges is misleading. At best, the name signifies potential rather than accomplishment. It is apparent in nearly every article or book written on two-year colleges that students, teachers, and the general public continue to value most the university-parallel aspects of these institutions. Even those institutions most committed to vocational programs and community service, and which expend tremendous money and effort in these areas, often find that their college preparatory curricula flourish with little attention and that their vocational and community programs, except in high prestige areas such as nursing and data processing, need constant care and nourishment if students are to be drawn or guided into them. This study has employed the term "community-junior college" as one which would indicate the historical origins as well as the current confusion of the community-junior college movement; it is not recommended as a substitute name for a so-called "community college" whose performance has yet to conform to its name.

---

[1] Johnson, General Education in Action, p. 73.

[2] Ibid., p. 77; Johnson, "General Education in the Junior College," p. 282.

National spokesmen for the community-junior college movement are unsure about the name of their movement because they are not certain about the relative importance of, and the relationships between, the expanding list of functions of the colleges. There are, of course, many reasons for this confusion. Funding from foundations and state and federal governments in recent years have tended to reward an increased emphasis on vocational-technical programs. Public sentiments, however, have remained strong for unrestricted opportunity in higher education and have promoted the idea that every individual should go as far in the educational system as his aspirations and abilities can take him.[1] It is not the purpose of this study, however, to explore all of the reasons for the current confusion in the community-junior college movement. It is important, however, to realize that this confusion is not merely the result of imperfect applications of a clearly understood community-junior college ideal. The ideal itself is confused. Whether the confusion in the ideology results from conflicting external economic and social forces or from unexamined thinking within the community-junior college movement is a moot question, and one that has been sometimes debated among the movement's spokesmen. Whatever the cause, ideological confusion has resulted and has come to the attention of community-junior college leaders. Ideologies by their very nature need to be largely assumed and seldom questioned to be effective. Thus, the community-junior college ideology is in trouble.

---

[1] Many foundations made grants to AAJC in the 1950's and 1960's. The Carnegie Corporation continued generous support, including substantial grants for studies and developmental programs in student personnel services and faculty training. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan, beginning in 1959, initiated support of expanding and strengthening AAJC services and staff. Since 1959, the Kellogg Foundation has contributed several million dollars to the support of AAJC, the establishment of junior college leadership programs, and other junior college projects. Some of the other foundations which have granted aid to AAJC are U.S. Steel Foundation, the Esso Educational Foundation, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and the Sears-Roebuck Foundation. Most of these grants, and

---

in particular the largest one from the Kellogg Foundation, were made in recognition of the important role that junior colleges could make in providing vocational curricula and effective counseling and guidance. The best source for information on the foundation grants is Gleazer's regular "From the Executive Secretary's Desk" report in each issue of the Junior College Journal. Also see Gleazer's This Is the Community College, pp. 38-39ff. The importance of the early Kellogg grants to AAJC is fully discussed in Brick, Forum and Focus, pp. 59-61.

The recommendations of presidential committees and commissions reflect the growing public belief in greater opportunity in higher education. The 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education which recommended two years of college for 49 percent of the population has been quoted many times in this study. The President's Committee on Education Beyond High School recommended in 1957 that communities anticipating substantial growth should consider building a two-year college. The President's Commission on National Goals in 1960 recommended that two-year colleges should be within commuting distance of all high school graduates, except in sparsely populated areas. The report of the President's Task Force on Higher Education in 1970 set the expansion of post-high school educational opportunity as the nation's top "continuing priority," highlighting the role of the two-year college and emphasizing the importance of counseling and guidance. See President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy (6 vols.; Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947); President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, Second Report to the President (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957); President's Commission on National Goals, Goals for Americans (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960); Report of the President's Task Force on Higher Education," Chronicle of Higher Education, October 19, 1970, pp. 3-4.

Not all social institutions grow as a part of a movement, and not all movements develop with an ideology. It is quite possible that the community-junior college movement, for better or for worse, is experiencing the passing of its ideology. For over a half century many different types of institutions--two-year and four-year (the 6-4-4 plan), religious and secular, public and private, liberal-arts and vocational, large and small--have been united by a common ideological bond. Perhaps the fundamental nature of the differences among the institutions made it all the more important for them to subscribe to a unifying ideology. It is ironic that as community-junior colleges have grown more alike the bonds of their ideology have loosened. As more and more community-junior colleges acquire the check-list of functions to make them authentic "community colleges," the common ideal of what the "community college" should be, not in terms of functions but in terms of its mission, is disintegrating. Where is the community college? We can find a community college and we can find community colleges, but the community college as a common conception is difficult to find. Such a concept can only exist in the minds of men dreaming of the ideal; when functionally structured to the present it is no longer the image of what should be.

CHAPTER V

OLD PROBLEMS AND NEW PROSPECTS

The community-junior college ideology may very well be disintegrating, but it has not yet vanished. Possibly, to borrow a once-popular term within the community-junior college movement, the ideological decline is not a "terminal" case. There are spokesmen for the community-junior college movement who are trying to keep old ideals alive and others who are trying to create new ones. While many have abandoned ideological formulations in lieu of operationally-defined functions, settling for a defined role in present society instead of promoting a vision of a better, future society, attempts to revive the missionary energy of the community-junior college movement continue. These attempts reveal some old problems and suggest some new prospects.

In this chapter we will encounter some ideas generated by emerging community-junior college leaders. Medsker, Reynolds, Colvert, and Johnson continue to contribute ideas to the movement, but they are near or have reached retirement age and do not represent the new generation of community-junior college theorists. Gleazer continues to hold a central position, and was made President instead of Executive Secretary of the restructured American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in 1972 (emphasis added). Important ideas from the new generation of community-junior college spokesmen have not yet had time to percolate through the movement sufficiently to determine whether they will be assimilated or discarded. Arthur M. Cohen, K. Patricial Cross, William Moore, Jr., and Terry O'Banion are among those emerging leaders whose writings have ideological overtones which we might profitably consider. Only the test of time will demonstrate whether their attempts to revitalize and reshape the community-junior college ideology will succeed or whether they will be isolated themes in a movement already largely given over to practical realities rather than ideological hopes.

While we cannot predict the outcome of contemporary efforts to renew or redirect community-junior college ideology, we can bring some historical perspective to bear on the obstacles such efforts face. There are continuing problems in the community-junior college movement which threaten to pierce old and new ideological formulations with harsh realities. One such problem is the continuing resistance of community-junior college students to accept roles assigned them in the ideology of a lower status than students of four-year colleges and universities. Another is the conflict between the need of an industrialized society for specially trained workers and the assumed need of a democratic nation for common values based on common experiences and understandings. Other problems, of more recent origin, also exist to hamper a unifying set of ideals. The "open door" has generally not admitted large groups of blacks and other minority groups. The "community college" has tended to serve only certain segments of its community. These problems, old and new, confront the emerging leaders of the community-junior college movement with the continuing challenge of bringing their practices in line with their ideology.

The Problem of the Terminal Student

There has been an ominous consistency in the fact that ever since the 1920's about two-thirds of entering community-junior college students plan to transfer to four-year colleges and universities but only about one-third of the total number actually do. Community-junior college spokesmen have attributed this phenomenon to several causes: (1) The high prestige that society has placed upon professional positions; (2) The inability of many students "realistically" to appraise their abilities, and their lack of abilities; and (3) The tendency of community-junior colleges to concentrate their resources more on transfer curricula than vocational-technical curricula. There has never been any suggestion that community-junior colleges should try harder to qualify two-thirds of their students to transfer; on the contrary, the idea of limited room at the top of the educational and social ladder has been an underlying assumption behind the consistent demand for increased terminal education.

The problem of the "terminal student" was seen as a stimulating challenge in the ideological campaign of community-junior college national spokesmen in the 1920's and 1930's. We have seen how Koos, Eells, and Campbell confidently expounded during those years that semiprofessional curricula leading to intermediate jobs, above the trades but below the professions, would appeal to such students. When terminal curricula was developed and found to be unappealing to most community-junior college students, the ideology was able to sidestep any reaction by asserting the need for guidance. If students were ignorant of their own capabilities and of occupational opportunities, it was logically argued, then they could not be expected to make wise decisions.

Since World War Two, some community-junior colleges have invested considerable effort and money in establishing wide-ranging terminal vocational-technical curricula and large student personnel staffs. Students in such colleges have received excellent information about themselves and about available careers, and they have had a wide selection of course programs to choose from. But Medsker's 1960 study showed that none of that seemed to matter; regardless of the type of college or its resources or programs, the general tendency persisted that approximately two-thirds of its entering students aspired to transfer on.[1]

With the publication of Burton R. Clark's The Open Door College in 1960, a painful awareness of what was happening to the "non-transferring" transfer student began to enter the thinking of many community-junior college leaders. Generally, unsuccessful transfer students did not switch into vocational-technical curricula; those curricula were generally filled by the other one-third of community-junior college students who began there in the first place. The unsuccessful transfer students, it was realized, even though follow-up studies on such students were rare, were in most cases drop-outs. Some community-junior college leaders took consolation in the fact that, as Clark described, such students were "cooled-out" rather than "thrown-out" as they might have been at the university. But such consolation was little help to an ideology based upon the premise that the community-junior college would serve the needs of such students.

Particularly painful was evidence that students dropping out of the community-junior college were doing about as well academically as those who stayed. A 1955 study by Jane Matson, which was widely reported in the community-junior college literature, compared a sample of withdrawing community-junior college students with a sample of persisting students and uncovered no significant differences between the groups regarding academic aptitude or grade point average.[2] If academic performance is not the major factor in sorting out students in the community-junior college, then one is left with disturbing questions about the actual causes of the high dropout rate which most studies indicate is approximately fifty percent. The search for adequate answers to these questions has led researchers into various directions. Investigations of personality differences among students, of institutional shortcomings, and of possible faults in society have all yielded different perspectives.

---

[1] Medsker, The Junior College: Progress and Prospect, p. 112.

[2] Jane E. Matson, "Characteristics of Students Who Withdraw from a Public Junior College" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955).

K. Patricia Cross has studied closely the community-junior college student population. Compared to their counterparts at four-year colleges, Cross found community-junior college students less able academically, less intellectually oriented, and less motivated to seek higher education. She cautioned, however, that "we possess only traditional measures to describe a student who does not fit the tradition."[1]

In particular, Cross has been concerned with that group of students an earlier generation would have called "terminal." Cross' definition of New Students includes ethnic minorities and adults, but primarily they are Caucasians from blue collar families:

> Fundamentally, these New Students to higher education are swept into college by the rising educational aspirations of the citizenry. For the majority, the motivation for college does not arise from anticipation of interest in learning the things they will be learning in college but from the recognition that education is the way to a better job and a better life than that of their parents.[2]

---

[1] K. Patricia Cross, The Junior College Student: A Research Description (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968), p. 6.

[2] K. Patricia Cross, Beyond the Open Door: New Students to Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971), p. 15.

Using data from several studies made in the 1960's, including Project TALENT and SCOPE,[1] Cross reported that:

> New students are positively attracted to careers and prefer to learn things that are tangible and useful. They tend not to value the academic model of higher education that is prized by faculty, preferring instead a vocational model that will teach them what they need to know to make a good living.[2]

Cross' conclusion has a familiar ring to it, sounding the call for new programs for New Students:

> To date, we have concentrated on making New Students over into the image of traditional students, so that they can be served by traditional education. Our concern has been the creation of access models to education. We have devised all kinds of ways to make New Students eligible to participate in traditional higher education. Remedial courses are designed to remove academic "deficiencies"; counseling removes motivational "deficiencies"; financial aid removes financial "deficiencies." However, if the answer to the question Who should go to college? is to be an egalitarian response of "everyone," then educational systems will have to be designed to fit the learning needs of New Students.[3]

When one looks at the individual interests, motivations, and abilities of New Students as Cross does, then it appears only obvious that new programs are needed if higher education, or postsecondary education, is to accommodate such students. Yet Cross is quite vague about the nature of the programs needed. She skillfully avoids traditional answers which signal pedagogic controversies, such as "vocational education" or "general education." Specifying three spheres which encompass the "world's work"--working with (1) people, (2) ideas, and (3) things, Cross proposes that "each citizen attains excellence in one sphere and at least minimal competence in the other two."[1] Cross does not specify educational programs appropriate to each sphere, nor does she indicate what criteria of "excellence" and "minimal competance" should be applied or how. But if the diverging camps behind general education versus vocational education, which will be discussed further in the following section, could embrace Cross' categorezation and incorporate it into a redirected ideology, the impact could be significant. There is little evidence, however, that this is likely to be the case.

---

[1] Project TALENT surveyed over 60,000 high school seniors in 1960, following up with further questionnaires in 1961 and 1965. SCOPE (School to College: Opportunity for Postsecondary Education) studied a four-state sample of over 30,000 high school seniors in 1966 with follow-up in 1967.

[2] Cross, Beyond the Open Door, p. 159.

[3] *Ibid*., pp. 4-5.

Sociologist Jerry M. Katz has charged that Cross' type of psychological research wrongly "diverts attention away from the system and toward the individual."[2] Katz follows Burton Clark's example and views the community-junior college as a social institution functioning in full accord with the values and needs of society. Like Clark, Katz made a case study of a California community-junior college. His goal was to determine which young people in the community were served by the college and how. Katz reported that the institution existed of, by and for the middle class. Sufficient barriers to prevent participation by lower classes existed, Katz charged, so that the so called open-door was a misnomer:

> Members of lower socioeconomic groups and racial and ethnic minorities, to a great degree, not only do not pass through the open door, they never approach it. The high attrition and low high school graduation rates of these groups makes attendance for most of them impossible. In the race toward equality the lower class is, essentially, disqualified before the race begins.[3]

The community-junior college helps maintain the stability of the class structure, according to Katz, "by safeguarding low ability children of the middle class from downward mobility."[1] While projecting an image which combines "apple pie and Horatio Alger," Katz concludes that in fact the community-junior college "is, in every respect, the creature of the middle class. It serves its master well."[2] From Katz's perspective, all of the rhetoric about assisting the "terminal student," by whatever label he is called, is merely a devise to insure a fixed social stratification to the benefit of the middle class.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 165.

[2] Jerry M. Katz, "The Educational Shibboleth: Equality of Opportunity in a Democratic Institution, the Public Junior College" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1967), p.15.

[3] Ibid., p. 191.

Jerome Karabel has expanded upon the sociological investigations of Clark and Katz.[3] Karabel discounts the claim that the community-junior college has extended benefits to middle and lower classes, charging that "educational inflation" has eaten up supposed gains. Both in educational content and economic value, Karabel finds that high school diplomas and college degrees have declined in worth as they become more available. Despite the tremendous expansion of the educational system this century, Karabel points out that only minimal changes have occured in the system of social stratification.[4]

Karabel reports that research on student attrition which controls variables such as socioeconomic status, aspirations, and ability reveals that student persistence, as measured by returning for a second year, seem negatively affected by attending a community-junior college. Karabel notes that the commuting situation of most community-junior college students may be a partial cause for the startling fact that, other things being equal, a student is less likely to persist in a community-junior college than in other institutions of higher education. Basically, however, Karabel finds that the cause is Clark's "cooling-out function" working effectively to protect existing social stratifications.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 191.

[3] Jerome Karabel, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," *Harvard Educational Review*, XLII (November, 1972), 522-562.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 525.

Writers within the community-junior college movement have ignored or rebuffed the charges that they are part of an effort to maintain social stratifications by cooling-out surplus students. Dorothy Knoell reviewed the existing research in 1966 and concluded that no conclusion was yet warranted:

> . . . no conclusion should be drawn without considerably more research on the accomplishments of the non-transfers in junior college and afterwards, to find out whether they became college drop-outs in the sense of a loss to society, or whether they were in fact terminal students who gained useful skills and general education while in college.[2]

While this matter may be in a state of suspended judgment, the community-junior college ideology cannot promote with the same zeal its mission to educate that class of people between the masses and the professionals. With its terminal curricula and its systems of guidance, the community-junior college has been tested and been found wanting. If the community-junior college ideology is to maintain a theme of equal opportunity for all, it will have to completely revise its belief in "guiding" students into their "proper" positions in society.

In the 1950's and 1960's, as mentioned in the last chapter, the community-junior college national spokesmen attempted to reaccess the nature and needs of the "non-transferring" transfer student. It will be recalled that B. Lamar Johnson attempted to persuade California community-junior college administrators to be "talent scouts" in search of many different types of student talent and potential rather than screening agents looking for student weaknesses and inabilities. This theme has been promoted also by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., the major spokesman for the community-junior college movement today. In 1959, Gleazer expanded upon the idea of different types of intelligence, a novel idea at that time in the community-junior college ideology:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 533.

[2] Dorothy Knoell, "A Critical Review of Research on the College Dropout," in The College Dropout and the Utilization of Talent, ed. by L. A. Pervin, L. E. Reik, and W. Dalrymple (Princeton University Press, 1966) p. 80.

> There is not only the kind of intelligence which characterizes the mathematician and the scientist. There is the intelligence of the artist whose insights cannot be classified or described by quantitative means. There is the intelligence of manipulative skill, the dexterity of supple and nimble fingers guided by a mind that seems tuned to the rhythm of sound and the beat of the machine. There is the social intelligence of the teacher with keen sensitivity to the frustrations and the triumphs of her students. There is the administrative intelligence of the man who can bring understanding and agreement out of the differences of strong minds divided in opinion. And there is the intelligence of tenderness and compassion of the nurse who ministers to humankind in valleys of pain and discouragement.[1]

In his 1968 treatise on the community college, Gleazer combines factors such as too much status-consciousness, individual abilities, social need, and varieties of intelligence to reinforce the ideal of distributing students more diversely in educational programs:

> The problem begins with an enthusiasm in our society for the "upper" (white collar) occupations, emphasizing the professional and managerial categories and consequently giving lower status to other occupational categories. In a nation which encourages aspiration and puts its faith in economic and social mobility, there is nothing wrong with this--if a person can indeed qualify for the presumably greater responsibilities at the top of the ladder and

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "From the Executive Director's Desk," Junior College Journal, XXIX (March, 1959), 424.

> if society can use him. Realistically, however, one must face the fact of an almost infinite variety of human talent and a bewildering array of societal tasks. It is to be hoped that talents and tasks can be linked up. Among the most urgent obligations of education is that of removing the handicaps that interfere with this process.[1]

For most of its existence, the community-junior college ideology has divided community-junior college students into transfer and terminal categories. Even students who stated that they were transfer students and who enrolled in transfer curricula were viewed, theoretically, as terminal students if they were not somehow predestined to transfer. The rationale supporting this view has been undermined, however, by an awareness that the two types of students are not really as different as believed. Furthermore, the needs of terminal students which were determined by community-junior college educators were not the needs expressed by those students themselves, even after the students were processed through systems of counseling and guidance. To survive at all, it is obvious that the community-junior college ideology has to incorporate a new view of students; indeed, a new view of human nature. This will not be easily done, for the old dichtomy goes deep into the structure of the ideology and affects all of its parts. Perhaps the ideas of Johnson and Gleazer are the beginning of a new perspective on students, and perhaps the views of human nature held by Cross and other emerging leaders will further the change. At this point in time, however, most of the ideas and structures in the community-junior college movement reflect the traditional view that students, indeed all men, can be rank-ordered and trained to the competency demanded at their level, a level determined by their nature and by the needs of society.

---

[1] Gleazer, This Is the Community College, p. 71..

Vocational Versus General Education

In recent years the community-junior college ideology, as explained in the previous chapter, has been unable to set priorities among the set of functions that a "community college" performs. Historically, the community-junior college ideology has never been able to establish whether vocational or general education was its primary target. As much as possible, the issue was side-stepped by the insistance that there was no dichotomy between education for a good life and education for a good living. The great faith in "terminal education" proclaimed in the 1920's and 1930's was shared by advocates of both vocational and general education, with the general educationalists having a slight edge. In that era, however, as Chapter III demonstrated, the proponents of general education foresaw the civic training of a particular semiprofessional class in society, a class that would have its own type of work to correspond to its relative social position. After World War Two as discussed in Chapter IV, the revival of general education exemplified the national concern for a citizenry which would be united in support of national policies and in opposition to foreign and internal conspiracies. During the 1940's and 1950's, national security took precedence over industrial training, although the two were seldom at odds. Perhaps it was the reaction to Sputnik I, or perhaps it was internal industrial needs asserting themselves over ideological defenses, that led to a resurgence in the late 1950's and in the 1960's of specialized industrial training and related services. Whatever the cause, it came.

In the mid-1960's, a surge of enthusiasm for vocational-technical education hit the community-junior college movement. Some of the impulse came from private foundations. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation, which had picked up some of AAJC's operational expenses in 1959, announced a three-quarter million dollar grant in 1965 "for a program which will provide leadership in stimulating and assisting the development of semiprofessional and technical programs in junior colleges." Reporting the grant to the AAFC membership, Gleazer admitted: "The Association has increasingly viewed this field as a major part of its mission."[1] At approximately the same time, Gleazer announced a grant from the Sloan Foundation to identify "pockets of excellence" in three clusters of technical fields--paramedical, engineering, and business. With only a nod to cultural education, Gleazer announced:

> The needs for specialized manpower and the education required to meet them relate directly to some of the most critical problems in American society today, poverty and unemployment, slums, and ethnic unrest. The right kind of education to meet these needs is that which is occupationally oriented. However, this does not mean that the program of education must be so exclusively vocational that it shuts out extension of cultural horizons or restricts adaptability to change.[2]

The federal government has also been an influencial force in support of increased vocational education. Joseph Cosand, once head of the St. Louis community-junior college system and then U.S. Assistant Commissioner of Education, has called for a new emphasis upon career choices and vocational training throughout the entire educational system, from kindergarten to graduate school.[3] For community-junior colleges in particular, federal aid for vocational programs has had a longer continous history and accounts for the largest single appropriation of any category of federal aid.[4] The Higher Education Act of 1972 authorized $85 million over a three year period for postsecondary occupational education, and less than one-third as much--$275,000--for the establishment of new community-junior colleges and the expansion of old ones. The Act makes this definition of postsecondary education:

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach: New Kellogg Commitment," Junior College Journal, XXXVI (December, 1965), 4.

[2] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach: A Partnership in Occupational Education," Junior College Journal, XXXV (February, 1965), 4.

[3] Quoted in James Hitchcock, "The New Vocationalism," Change, V (April, 1973), 47.

[4] John Lombardi, "A New Look at Vocational Education," Change, (Special Junior College Edition), V (March, 1973), 32b.

> The term "postsecondary occupational education" means education, training, or retraining . . . conducted by an institution . . . which is designed to prepare individuals for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers or technicians or sub-professionals in recognized occupations (including new and emerging occupations) . . . but excluding any program to prepare individuals for employment in occupations . . . to be generally considered professional or which require a baccalaureate or advanced degree.[1]

Clearly, the bulk of the federal monies aim to support vocational education, and just as clearly aim not to support transfer-oriented programs in community-junior colleges.

The business community is another apparent force behind increased vocational education in community-junior colleges. In part this is reflected in support from foundations previously mentioned. The preponderance of businessmen on local Boards of Trustees also tends to bolster support for vocational programs. Cohen states that when "corporate managers . . . announce a need for skilled workers . . . college administrators trip over each other in their haste to organize a new technical curriculum."[2] Increasingly, nationally prominent businessmen are underscoring the importance of vocational education in community-junior colleges.[3] This stands in marked contrast to the overwhelming support given by the business community during the earlier half of the century to the development of "social intelligence" and "citizenship" rather than specific technical skills.

---

[1] Quoted in Karabel, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," p. 545.

[2] Arthur M. Cohen, "Stretching Pre-College Education," Social Policy, II (May/June, 1971), 6.

[3] P. B. Ryan, "Why Industry Needs the Junior College," in William K. Ogilvie and Max R. Raines (eds.), Perspectives on the Community-Junior College (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1971), p. 71.

As might be expected, advocates of vocational-technical education do not entirely dismiss the importance of general education for purposes of better citizenship, but they argue that profound social benefits accrue from expanded job training. Norman Harris, the leading community-junior college spokesman committed singularly to technical-vocational education, makes this argument concerning social values and the costs of technical education:

> When people say society cannot afford to provide higher education for all who can profit by it, tell them we cannot afford not to provide it . . . Call their attention to such costs as these, which society seems to pay without too much anguish: $1,800 a year to keep a juvenile delinquent in a detention home; $3,500 a year to keep a criminal in a state prison; $2,500 a year (or more) for an unemployed worker and his family on relief . . . .
>
> The $800 per year per student for a good junior college technical program sounds like a bargain special in comparison.[1]

Although the curricular pendulum in community-junior colleges seems to be swinging toward a major emphasis upon vocational-technical education, the movement is not without resistance. Cohen has observed that

> . . . the ghost of general education continues to flit about the corridors of the junior colleges, jumping out at vocational and technical teachers, swinging in the rafters at every meeting of the curriculum committees, standing nobly beside the president each time he attends a convocation.[2]

The majority of faculty, as almost all writers about community-junior colleges note, cling to ideas of education from their own four-year college and university educations, in which general education was upheld by strict requirements. Even Gleazer's strong support for a new emphasis upon vocational education is softened by a continuing commitment to developing the

---

[1] Norman C. Harris, "Major Issues in Junior College Technical Education," In Ogilvie and Raines, Ibid., p. 273.

[2] Arthur M. Cohen and Associates, A Constant Variable (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1971), pp. 128-129.

"whole person." While arguing for increased technical education, Gleazer has been careful to add that such training prepares one for job entry only and that a life-long commitment is not called for. He avoids the phrase "terminal education," and prefers to speak of an open-ended future for individuals completing vocational-technical curricula. In one of Gleazer's [redacted] recent writings, his commitment to general education emerges in the form of developing individual self-concepts in students, a humanistic goal which he places before both manpower needs and the need to resolve community-junior college "identity-crisis":

> I say that our clues to service in these days of our lives are not taken from the conventional and traditional ways of education. To accommodate to the recognized and authorized structures of higher education is not the most essential matter. Our paramount goal is not to produce technicians for the nation's economy. Our aims are not fulfilled in a national manpower policy--forgive the very expression. Somehow--with all of our numbers--our bigness--the mission before us now is not to establish the identity of the junior college but to discover how our resources can be utilized as the young people and adults in the areas we serve discover their own identities.
>
> This I think is the most pressing problem of our day--in a world of multiplying billions of people--in a society of rapid change. The student--young or older--asks: Who am I? What are the options before me? How do I achieve them? Not for a moment would I suggest that our institutions have sole responsibility for the emergence of the individual's self-concept. But I do maintain that there is a great deal we can do, and without this abiding concern as a beginning point to set our scale of values, our programs and procedures will fail.[1]

There are strong voices remaining in the community-junior college movement which argue in defense of general education as opposed to specialized training. Arthur M. Cohen, perhaps following in the footsteps of B. Lamar Johnson—his senior colleague at the University of California at Los Angeles, has constructed a visionary model of futuristic and idealistic community-junior college education based upon four core courses in the "traditional areas of communications, humanities, sciences, and social sciences."[1] Not mere introductory courses to specialized disciplines, these courses are interdisciplinary and aim to involve students in personally relevant learning. Vocational education takes place outside of the college, in factories and shops, with the college certifying satisfactory completion of training in accord with requirements. The college itself, however, is not a workshop but a center for learning through objectives the broad areas of knowledge historically significant in the human experience.

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach: A Time of Change," Junior College Journal, XL (April, 1970), 5.

Terry O'Banion has spent a decade, first as a Dean of Students at two Florida community-junior colleges and then as a professor of higher education at the University of Illinois, proposing curricular and student personnel programs to develop student self-awareness and to assist self-development. Rather than fitting students to existing notches in society, O'Banion envisions a core of general education experiences building upon knowledge of self and expanding into knowledge of others, society and the world. O'Banion does not ignore the external realities of job markets, but he does assign them a lesser priority than student self-fulfillment.[2]

K. Patricia Cross' curricular goals for three areas of competence for all students, mentioned previously, can also be considered in support of general education, although Cross does not tackle the basic question of the relative importance between general and specialized learning. It is easy to pay lip service to both general and vocational education, and just as easy to deny any real conflict between the two, but at some point curriculum planners must face the divisive question of how many courses will be required for degree-seeking students. Out of a fixed number of units in a one or two-year program, battlelines are formed over how many units will be required for general education courses, for specialized courses in the major field, and for elective choices. While few educators in the community-junior college movement claim that all of a student's program should be devoted to either general or specialized courses exclusively, there appears to be no simple ground for compromise in the middle.

---

[1] Arthur M. Cohen, Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. 14.

[2] See Terry O'Banion, Alice Thurston, and James Gulden, "Student Personnel Work: An Emerging Model," Junior College Journal, XLI (November, 1970), 6-14; also see Terry O'Banion and April O'Connell, The Shared Journey: An Introduction to Encounter (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1970), and Terry O'Banion, Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1972).

Collins and Collins have argued for a fifty-fifty split between general and specialized learning, as strong a claim for general education units found in the community-junior college movement in recent years. Their rationale is forceful, taking into account the basic arguments for extensive general education:

> (There is an) essential difference between the value perception of the comprehensive community college and that of the technical institute. The latter works toward producing a well-honed, efficient, productive cog who will fit neatly into the economy and who will find his satisfactions in the rewards of the economy. The comprehensive public community college makes the rejoinder that if economic productivity were the only aim, then the stockholders to whom the profit will accrue should pay for the training of the worker, just as they pay for the machine which he will operate. Education is an obligation of the total society because it is the total man, not just the economic man, who, one by one, makes up the membership of that society. It is this unequivocal insistence that no part should dominate the whole, that a man is a man not just a unit of production, which lies behind the resistance of many curriculum committees to establish certificate programs in vocational specialties, and which explains the frequent 1:1 ratio of general to specialty education written into the graduation requirements. This last observation applies as much to the transfer student as to the technical-vocational student. If the associate in arts or associate in science degree calls for a minimum of sixty semester units, then no more than thirty should be in a specialty field whether that specialty be pre-professional chemistry or pre-vocational electronics. In either case the remaining thirty units should be devoted to those

> common elements which experience has demonstrated to be essential to preparation for manhood, for fulfillment of potential, for self-actualization.[1]

Few community-junior colleges required 30 units of general education in 1966, when the Collins brothers made their case, and even fewer do today. The state of California, with the greatest number of community-junior colleges, recently mandated a minimum of fifteen general education units for an A.A. or an A.S. degree, but a student may very well satisfy three or six of the required units through introductory courses to his specialized course of study. Many one-year programs have no general education requirements at all. Thus the community-junior college ideology has far to go before it can embrace the idea that personal fulfillment, in terms of a student's own perceptions, is the goal of the movement. The movement has always held the assumption that the structure of an industrial society was inevitably and desirably fixed, and that their primary role was to adapt individuals to that structure. While always seeking an accommodation between individual wants and social realities, community-junior colleges have always operated as if reality existed in the social structure and fancy existed in the minds of individuals.

Minority Groups and the "Open Door"

The community-junior college ideology did not develop in a vacuum. Its basic concepts were essentially those prevailing in the wider American society. The protestant-capitalistic ethic of individualism, hard work, and competition permeated the community-junior college ideology just as it did most other segments of American thought. It was a type of individualism which allowed and often encouraged a teamwork approach in support of government and business but which seldom conceived a legitimate organized, collective opposition to established governmental and business policies. In this study, community-junior college national spokesmen have been quoted challenging the legitimacy of labor organizations and advocating the breaking-down of family customs which presented obstacles to the educational goals of their institutions. Until fairly recently, as Rush Welter has observed in regard to American education as a whole, community-junior college educators have been confident that they could shape individual intellects into a common enough pattern to insure social harmony. But, as Welter has pointed out, recent years have witnessed a loss of faith in the power of "popular intelligence" to keep society on an orderly course, and theories of group interests and countervailing powers have appeared to be more realistic means of social order and balance.[1] Without necessarily accepting Welter's thesis as fact, it can be used to explain in part the inability of the community-junior college ideology to cope with the sudden realization that the community-junior college, which boasted of an "open door" for all individuals was at the same time closed to large groups.

---

[1] C.C. Collins and J.J. Collins, The Case for the Community College: A Critical Appraisal of Philosophy and Function (El Cajon, California: Published by the authors, 1966), pp. 27-28.

James W. Reynolds, who all along was less inclined to believe that the "community colleges" were actually geared to community needs, was one of the few community-junior college national spokesmen selected for this study to raise the question of group discrimination in community-junior colleges. Studying selected junior colleges in various parts of the nation in the late 1950's, Reynolds interviewed people from the community at large, key people in the community (public officials, well-known businessmen, etc.), as well as college administrators, teachers, and students. He then compared the attitudes, awareness, and accuracy of the various groups as they related to community-junior college community service programs. Reynolds reported that 73 percent of the upper class and 67 percent of the middle class surveyed had participated in various junior college classes and community service programs, but that only 38 percent of the lower class sample had so participated. Reynolds concluded:

---

[1] Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), pp. 329-335.

> The junior college community service program currently is not serving members of the lower social classes. Reasons ascribed for this include insufficient awareness of the program, and unrealistic opinions concerning it. This conclusion carries specific implications regarding a needed expansion of the program.[1]

It has taken community-junior college educators some time to realize or to care that their institutions did not attract many disadvantaged or ethnic minority students, and that those attracted faced dim prospects. Black administrator William Moore, Jr., angrily charged in 1970 that community-junior college teachers, counselors, and administrators designed and operated a curriculum with an unfair number of barriers for those he calls "high-risk students."[2] Inadequate testing measures and disparaging remedial programs were particular targets of Moore's anger. Moore noted that student unrest in the nation's community-junior colleges, unlike that at universities, came from ethnic students without opportunities for success.

In some areas, particularly inner-city ghetto-type areas, community-junior colleges have made stark changes in response to student needs--demands, in some cases. Malcolm X College in Chicago and Merritt College in California led the way in developing complete Black study curriculums which afforded to students uninterested and unsuccessful in traditional studies new opportunities.[3] In community-junior colleges as a whole, enrollments of ethnic minority students is rising rapidly, although still below their proportional percentage in the entire population.[1] A third of the two-year colleges in 1972 reported offering minority focused programming, and only twelve had identifiable units or locations for minority studies, such as a Black Cultural Center or a Chicano Center.[2]

---

[1] James W. Reynolds, An Analysis of Community Service Programs (1960) mimeographed, p. 60.

[2] William Moore, Jr., Against the Odds (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970).

[3] John Lombardi and Edgar A. Quimby, Black Studies in Community Colleges (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971).

Some community-junior college educators, particularly Moore, Cross, Dorothy Knoell, and William Birenbaum,[3] have been attempting to penetrate the community-junior college ideology with the sharp question of whether equal access to higher education is really enough. For true equality of opportunity, they argue that special programs and methods are needed. Success with peer counseling and tutoring, non-punitive grading, and specially trained teachers led these authors to recommend scuttling counter-productive "testing and telling", and demeaning remedial courses.

One of the serious problems encountered in developing new programs for new students is that such programs may lack academic transferability and be considered "the low road." The history of minority groups being channeled into remedial and vocational programs lesser in status and earning power than B.A. degree oriented programs cautions wary minorities about "terminal" programs disguised by new labels. Minority students have often been victimized by that part of the community-junior college idelogy which directs that each student should be trained for a suitable role in society in keeping with his interests and abilities. With low motivation and low scores on tests of academic aptitude often accompanying the minority student to the community-junior college, it is common to place him in a remedial program with negative status. His courses often have course numbers beginning with zero's to indicate that they are not really college-level courses. Such a structure is not consciously designed to "keep the disadvantaged down," but is rather the result of the long-standing idea in the community-junior college ideology that there is a natural ordering of educational levels, occupational levels, and levels of human talent which exist on a linear scale and all of which correlate with each other. It is a new form of Social Darwinism which seeks out the differences among men and attempts to structure them along a continuum from inferior to superior.

---

[1] In 1972, one study reported that 9.2% of full-time community-junior college students were Negroes and 3.7% were Mexican-Americans. Faculty members representing Negro, Mexican-American, Puerto-Rican, and American Indian accounted for only 4.5% of full-time community-junior college faculty. See Andrew Goodrich, Lawrence Lexotte, and James Welch, "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges," Community and Junior College Journal, XLIII (December, 1972/January, 1973), pp. 28-31.

[2] *Ibid*., p. 30.

[3] Moore and Cross have already been introduced. Birenbaum's ideas are concisely stated in William Birenbaum, "Equal Access to What?," ERIC Junior College Research Review, V (May, 1971), 10-11. Also see Dorothy M. Knoell, People Who Need College: A Report on Students We Have Yet To Serve (Washington, D.C.: AAJC, 1970).

The reluctance of minority students to enroll in remedial and vocational programs reflects more than past discriminations. Karabel comments on the tendency for all students to resist programs which do not transfer:

> This is not an irrational obsession with four-year diplomas on the part of the students. It is not just snobbish prejudice: there are sound structural reasons for the low status of career education in the community college. At the base of an educational institution's prestige is its relationship to the occupational and class structure of the society in which it operates. The community college lies at the base of the stratification of higher education both in the class origins of its students and in their occupational destinations. Within the community college, the vocational curriculum is at the bottom of the prestige hierarchy--again, both in terms of social composition and likely adult status.
>
> It is unrealistic, then, to expect that community college vocational programs, the bottom tract of higher education's bottom track, will have much status . . .
>
> The educational establishment's concern with the low status of occupational programs in the community colleges reveals much more about its own ideology than it does about the allegedly irrational behavior of students resistant to vocational education.[1]

It is true that the community-junior college ideology has tended to conceal the social causes of students' "unrealistic aspirations," yet Karabel might also have added that the conservative view of community-junior college leaders led them to think more of national stability than unfulfilled needs of groups or individuals. In a 1969 policy statement on the role of community-junior colleges in regard to disadvantaged groups, the Board of Directors of AAJC revealed their national aims and their desire for a homogenous, harmonious population:

---

[1] Karabel, "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," pp. 548-549.

> The Association recognizes that poverty and prejudice are barriers to opportunity for millions of Americans and thus impediments that restrict and threaten national progress. AAJC also believes that education, and particularly two-year colleges, must help lead the assault which now is only in its formative stages. This assault must not close only the gap in educational opportunities, but cultural and economic gaps as well, and the two-year colleges can and should play a leading role in overcoming all of these gaps.[1]

Since Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. stands out among the community-junior college national spokesmen in this study as the most active contemporary theorist, his ideas will again be considered here, this time in regard to the openness of the "open door." It is an issue which Gleazer himself identified as the most critical one facing community-junior colleges in the 1970's, even more critical than financial support, recruitment of good faculty, or resolving the "identity crisis."[2] Gleazer viewed the issue as nothing less than one of whether or not the community-junior college was a promise or a fake:

> Almost glibly the community college has been described as an open-door institution. Its adherents have said that it draws a new college-going population, that it is an agency for social and economic mobility, that it provides educational opportunity where none existed before, that the junior college meets a variety of needs that other higher institutions cannot or will not meet, that in a program of universal educational opportunity the community college will be the key institution.

---

[1] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach: Programs for the Disadvantaged," Junior College Journal, XXXIX (March, 1969), 11.

[2] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "The Community College Issue of the 1970's," Educational Record, LI (Winter, 1970), 48-49.

> Do these statements have a familiar ring? They do to me, because I doubt that anybody has made them more often than I. And I believe firmly that by taking this direction of development the community college will earn its reason for being. But it is my impression that too few have seen the open door or heard the invitation, and altogether too many who have taken us at our word have found that their real needs have not been met. We must do better, or the promise is a fake.[1]

For a loyal adherent to an ideology to even imagine that a basic part of the ideology might be a fake is an unmistakable sign that the ideology is faltering. It was one thing for Burton R. Clark, an outsider to the movement, to question the real nature of the "open door," and quite another thing for the Executive Director of AAJC to do the same.

But Gleazer did not always fix such a critical eye on this aspect of the community-junior college ideology; often he uttered its rhetoric without the slightest hint of doubt. In his book on the community college he stated:

> . . . the poor in the inner city have in part created their own barriers, partly psychological and partly due to lack of understanding, to taking advantage of the community colleges' open doors. And the colleges in the past have ignored and neglected these people, failing to reach out to them and to destroy the barriers. Today, ways are being found to involve the poor in programs at the community college level which will help them help themselves to find social fulfillment.[2]

When Max Lerner used his syndicated newspaper column to state that junior colleges lacked prestige for black students, Gleazer responded defensively. "If Mr. Lerner is right," Gleazer retorted, "then what are the thousands of black students who are enrolled in junior colleges doing there?"[3] Even though Gleazer would admit the same problem at other times, particularly addressing people within the movement, his inability to accept the problem when stated by an outsider is no doubt related to his strong ideological commitment to the community-junior college movement.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 49.

[2] Gleazer, This Is the Community College, pp. 88-89.

[3] Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "AAJC Approach: The Prestige Factor," Junior College Journal, XL (September, 1969), 5.

A confession of past sins and a promise to rectify them need not weaken an ideology; indeed, such a step could revive faltering idealism. One wonders if such a revival will result from Gleazer's recent campaign to revive general education with a focus on the individual "self" and to make good on the promise of the "open door." Gleazer seems to be bringing this all together into a new ideological pattern when he states:

> Can we come up with the instructional strategies, the professional attitudes, and the kind of community understanding of our task which will really put us into the business of tapping pools of human talent not yet touched? There is something still a little distasteful about this. We talk about "slow learners" and "educationally handicapped" and "disadvantaged" in ways that sometimes seem so condescending that if I were one of the so-called "disadvantaged," I would say: "Go to the ~~Devil~~!" How can we achieve a depth of understanding not only about the real needs of potential students, but also about ourselves and our institutions, our shortcomings, limitations, and cultural tunnel vision, so that we can begin to communicate?[1]

In the past, the "open door" basically led to three types of exits: one leading on to higher educational institutions; one leading to semiprofessional careers; and one which was hidden from view through which uncounted numbers of "cooled-out" students left the community-junior college. To pass successfully through the institution's corridors, students were expected not only to acquire necessary skills but also to develop a basically uniform style of life and type of thinking that community-junior college leaders deemed essential to the orderly progress of the nation. If the ideal of the community-junior college is broadened to support a variety of life-styles and educational programs as wide as the proverbial "open door," and if the nature of man is truly considered to be benign and inclined toward positive, self-fulfilling growth, then perhaps the community-junior college ideology is taking a significant turn. But if, in fact, humanistic rhetoric is being used merely as window-dressing to make more palatable a fundamental desire to structure human beings to assume unfilled positions in a specialized, industrialized society, then the discrepancy between the ideal and the real will continue to widen until the very proponents of the ideology can no longer subscribe to it in good conscience. At that point, if it should ever come, the community-junior college ideology can be pronounced officially dead.

---

[1] Gleazer, "The Community College Issue of the 1970's," p. 51.

Conclusion

One should not judge the value of the community-junior college movement in the United States by considering only its ideology. Because community-junior college national spokesmen sold the idea of guidance and counseling as a means to redirect university-aspiring students into vocational programs, it does not necessarily follow that counselors in the community-junior colleges did not often aid and abet their students in achieving goals that their records showed to be unrealistic. And because the spokesmen articulated the ideal of the masses conforming to waspish ideas of moral behavior, it does not mean that community-junior college students did not often acquire from some of their instructors and from other students a greater tolerance of different life-styles allowing them to emerge from the institutions with a more flexible repertoire of behaviors and more independent attitudes. It is perhaps one of the saving graces of the community-junior college movement that varieties of human talent have often emerged in ways unintended by its builders.

It is difficult to take comfort, however, in the main thrust of the community-junior college ideology. Overall, it has been built upon an idealization of an industrialized, technological society and a fear of the meaner aspects of human nature. It has sought conformity in the masses to insure against internal disorder and international weakness. It has accepted an elitist view of human nature and has structured its institutions to sort the elite from the masses. It has presumed to know what the masses of people want, undaunted by the fact that the people "thought they wanted something different."

If today we lived in an industrial utopia in which men felt their nature fulfilled, then perhaps the arrogance and dictatorialism of the ideology would appear prophetic and rational. But that ideal state has yet to be reached and is in fact being questioned by ever increasing numbers of people as an achievable ideal. In today's world, the earlier vision of a super-technocracy appears more of a nightmare than a dream. The community-junior college national spokesmen did not create their own vision of a future society; the belief in progress, a rationally structured society, and operable scales of social and human evolution abounded during the last half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries. It may very well appear to us today that their plans were more elitist than democratic, more totalitarian than contributive to a free society, and more mechanistic than humanistic. It did not appear so to them. There was no conspiracy to foster an elitist, undemocratic, industrial society. Conspiracy involves secrecy, and the plans of community-junior college national spokesmen were open and aboveboard for all to see. Today we see them differently than they did, or at least we measure them against different values.

Accepting the sincerity and good faith of community-junior college national spokesmen, however, does not ease the discomfort which comes with the realization that their stated ideals were distinctly elitist, undemocratic, and disparaging of human nature. At the outset of this study, the writer found frequent references to such terms as "democratic citizenship," "individual opportunity," and "the people's college" which initially appeared to offset some of the more blatant statements of the need for popular control and efficient structuring in society. At first the writer thought that, like the good Christians they were, the spokesman sought to promote action by illustrating both the attractions of heaven and the horrors of hell. But their vivid images of hell--the constant threat of the masses to society--and their abstract images of heaven--an undefined technological society that existed somewhere in the future--made it seem obvious that their minds were on present evil rather than future good. The community-junior college ideology does have a number of democratic terms in its vocabulary, but the concepts behind the terms and the manner in which they have generally been employed reflect a greater interest in social control than in helping individuals to promote their own development.

In many ways, then, the passing of the community-junior college ideology, if attempts to revive it fail and it does in fact disintegrate, is not one to be mourned. Perhaps, as many contemporary community-junior college national spokesmen maintain, more of a realistic and less of an ideological understanding of the community-junior college is needed to allow it to function effectively and to communicate more clearly with other educational institutions and the general public. It is not necessary to forsake all ideals while jettisoning an ideology; it does become necessary, however, to state such ideals with an acceptance of realistic limitations imposed by existing conditions. What is given up with the loss of an ideology is a future dream and a plan for making it come true. Depending on the dream, that is a great deal to lose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Selected Works by Jesse P. Bogue

"The American Public Approves the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XXV (April, 1955), 445-447.

"The Community College." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, XXXIV (June, 1948), 285-295.

The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.

"Education in a Changing World." Junior College Journal, XIV (September, 1943), 3-4.

"The Functions of Good Public Relations in Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XXVIII (December, 1957), 223-228.

"The Future of the Church-Related College." Junior College Journal, XXVI (March, 1956), 411-417.

"The Future of the Junior College," School Executive, LXVI (July, 1947), 11-13.

"A Good Junior College." Texas Outlook, XXXI (August, 1947), 22-23ff.

"The Junior College." National Education Association Journal, XXXVI (April, 1947), 271.

"The Junior College in American Education." Junior College Journal, X (October, 1939), 65-69.

"A National Policy for Education." Junior College Journal, XVI (April, 1946), 339-340.

"The Private Junior College in Wartime." Junior College Journal, XII (May, 1942), 499-500.

"The Role of the Junior College for the Youth of Today." National Association of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXXI (April, 1947), 129-135.

"Some Critical Problems in Junior Colleges." California Journal of Secondary Education, XXII (March, 1947), 143-146.

Selected Works by Doak S. Campbell

"After Sixteen Years." Junior College Journal, VII (December, 1936), 109-110.

A Critical Study of the Stated Purposes of the Junior College. Contribution to Education No. 70. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1930.

"Effects of the Depression." Junior College Journal, III (April, 1933), 381-382.

"Encouragement--or Great Concern?" Junior College Journal, VIII (November, 1937), 109-110.

"Final Report on Terminal Education Study." Junior College Journal, XVI (May, 1946), 432.

"From Within." Junior College Journal, IV (December, 1933), 109-110.

"The Future of the Junior College." Association of Texas Colleges Bulletin, I (May, 1929), 30-32.

"The Importance of Curriculum Revision in the South." Southern Association Quarterly, III (February, 1939), 50-52.

"The Junior College Administrative Head." Peabody Journal of Education, XI (September, 1933), 53-57.

"The Junior College Curriculum." Junior College Journal, III (May, 1933), 416-419.

"Junior College Standards." Junior College Journal, II (November, 1931), 63.

"Junior Colleges and Defense--Today and Tomorrow." Junior College Journal, XI (March, 1941), 363-364.

"A Larger Junior College Program." Junior College Journal, V (December, 1934), 109-110.

"The Public Junior College--An Agent of Democracy--The Social Aspects." Department of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXXV (March, 1931), 150-165.

"The Purposes of the Junior College." National Education Association Journal, XXI (October, 1932), 221-222.

"Retrospect and Prospect." Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 440-443.

"Social Studies and Our National Defense Program." School and Community, XXVII (February, 1941), 76ff.

"Some Observations on Junior College Development." Junior College Journal, (April, 1955), 463-464.

Southern Educator: Selected Addresses. Florida State University Studies No. 25. Tallahassee: The Florida State University, 1957.

Selected Works by C. C. Colvert

"Administering the Student-Activity Program." Junior College Journal, XVIII (March, 1948), 394-399.

"Aviation Courses in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XV (February, 1945), 245-248.

"Curriculum Trends in Junior College." Junior College Journal, IX (October, 1938), 12-17.

"The Expanding Role of the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XXVIII (January, 1958), 245-246.

"A Half-Century of Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XVII (February, 1947), 244-247.

"Jesse Parker Bogue." Junior College Journal, XXX (March, 1960), 369-370.

"The Junior College: An Institution With a Four-fold Purpose." Southern Association Quarterly, VIII (May, 1944), 262-270.

"The Junior College and Student Needs." Junior College Journal, X (November, 1939), 123-124.

"Junior College Responsibility in Total Defense." Junior College Journal, XI (September, 1940), 3-4.

"Problems in Junior College Teacher Education." Texas Outlook, XXX (June, 1946), 39-40.

The Public Junior College Curriculum. Louisiana State University Studies No. 38. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1939.

"Terminal Education and National Defense." Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 492-497.

"Why Not the Name 'Junior College'?" Junior College Journal, XXVI (September, 1955), 1-2.

Selected Works by Walter Crosby Eells

"Adjustments in the Junior College Curriculum." Junior College Journal, III (May, 1933), 401-410.

"Adult Education in California Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, V (May, 1935), 437-448.

"Annual Report of Executive Secretary." Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 498-510.

The California Junior College Mental-Education Survey. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1930.

"California Junior Colleges Through the Eyes of Their Students." Proceedings of the Tenth Annual American Association of Junior Colleges Meeting. Atlantic City, N.J., 1929.

"The Civilian Pilot Training Program." Junior College Journal, XI (November, 1940), 125-130.

"Developments in Higher Education--Wise and Otherwise." Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, XVII (July, 1942), 455-492.

"The Early History of California Public Junior Colleges." California Quarterly of Secondary Education, IV (April, 1929), 214-222.

"Evaluation of Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, X (October, 1939), 63-64.

"Intentions of Junior College Students." Junior College Journal, VII (October, 1936), 3-10.

The Junior College. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1931.

"The Junior College and Dental Education." Junior College Journal, XV (March, 1945), 297-302.

"The Junior College and the Youth Problem." Kadelpian Review, XV (November, 1935), 9-13.

"The Junior College in the Postwar Period." Junior College Journal, XIV (October, 1943), 51-52.

"The Junior College--Its Character and Prospects." National Educational Association Journal, XXII (May, 1933), 157-158.

"Junior College Patriarchs." Junior College Journal, X (February, 1940), 307-309.

"Junior College Terminal Education." Junior College Journal, X (January, 1940), 244-250.

"The Junior College--What Manner of Child Shall This Be?" Junior College Journal, I (February, 1931), 309-328.

"Junior Colleges Are Here to Stay." Nation's Schools, XXXV (April, 1945), 28.

"Junior Colleges in War Service--Summary." Junior College Journal, XIV (May, 1944), 431.

"National Junior College Administrator Poll." Junior College Journal, X (November, 1939), 125-126.

"Pioneer Trail or Educational Highway." Junior College Journal, VI (November, 1935), 55-56.

"Possible Alternatives: The Junior College or--." Junior College Journal, V (November, 1934), 55-57.

"Preparation of Junior College Instructors." Junior College Journal, VII (October, 1936), 55-56.

Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education. Terminal Education Monograph No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.

"Secondary and Junior College Curricula." Junior College Journal, VI (May, 1936), 392-398.

"Secondary or Higher Education?" Junior College Journal, XI (October, 1940), 63-64.

"State Higher Education in California." Junior College Journal, III (October, 1932), 30-37.

"Student Mortality in Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XXVII (November, 1956), 132-137.

"The Tax Supported Junior College During the Next Decade." Department of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XLV (March, 1933), 147-165.

"Terminal Education for Youth." Phi Delta Kappan, XXIV (February, 1942), 258-260.

"'This Junior College Movement'--Again." School and Society, XXXI (May 3, 1930), 598-601.

"Vocational or Semi-Professional?" Junior College Journal, IX (November, 1938), 61-62.

"What Needs to be Done Now in American Education." Nation's Schools, IX (January, 1932), 21-26.

Why Junior College Terminal Education? Terminal Education Monograph No. 3. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.

Selected Works by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.

"AAJC Approach: A Partnership in Occupational Education." Junior College Journal, XXXV (February, 1965), 4-5.

"AAJC Approach: A Time of Change." Junior College Journal, XL (April, 1970), 3-5.

"AAJC Approach: Matching Our Times." Junior College Journal, XXXV (March, 1965), 2-3.

"AAJC Approach: New Kellogg Commitment." Junior College Journal, XXXVI (December, 1965), 4.

"AAJC Approach: Programs for the Disadvantaged." Junior College Journal, XXXIX (March, 1969), 9-11.

"AAJC Approach: The Independent Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XL (March, 1970), 9.

"AAJC Approach: The Prestige Factor." Junior College Journal, XL (September, 1969), 5.

"Coats Off by the Two-Year Colleges." Junior College Journal, XXVII (May, 1957), 515-520.

"The Community College Issue of the 1970's." Educational Record, LI (Winter, 1970), 47-52.

"The Community College of Today and Tomorrow." American Teacher Magazine, XLVII (April, 1963), 7-8ff.

"It's Time to Ask Some Questions." Junior College Journal, XXVIII (November, 1957), 123-124.

"The Junior College--Bigger! Better?" Junior College Journal, XXVIII (May, 1958), 484-487.

"Junior College Explosion." American Education, V (December, 1968), 12-13.

"The Junior College World." Junior College Journal, XXX (October, 1959), 115-119.

"A National Approach to Junior College Leadership." Journal of Secondary Education, XXXVI (January, 1961), 58-64.

"Public Relations Is a Two-Way Street." Junior College Journal, XXVII (November, 1956), 123-124.

This Is the Community College. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

"Universal Community College Education." School and Society. VC (March 4, 1967), 139-140.

Selected Works by John W. Harbeson

"Aviation Technology at Pasadena." Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 482-485.

"Can Junior Colleges Meet Youth's Needs?" Junior College Journal, IX (January, 1939), 169-174.

"The Community College." National Education Association Journal, XXXVII (October, 1949), 502-503.

"Curriculum for Human Need." Educational Leadership, IV (December, 1946), 193-198.

"Discussion on Vocational Education." Junior College Journal, VIII (May, 1938), 423-425.

"Educating for Initiative." National Education Association Journal, XV (November, 1926), 259-260.

"Evaluating the 6-4-4 Plan." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XXXII (March, 1948), 143-151.

"An Evaluation of the Practice of Classifying High School Graduates into Separate Recommended and Non-Recommended Groupings." California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VII (October, 1931), 34-40.

"The Experimental Program at Pasadena." Junior College Journal, VIII (April, 1938), 353-355.

"General Curricula." Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 593-596.

"Integration Between High School and College." Sierra Educational News, XXXII (June, 1936), 21-22ff.

"The Junior College and the Post-War Period." Junior College Journal, XIII (November, 1942), 131-133.

"The Junior College in the Present Emergency." Junior College Journal, XII (April, 1942), 435-436.

"Junior Colleges and Total War." Junior College Journal, XIII (October, 1942), 67-69.

"The Nature and Functions of the Forward-Looking Secondary School." California Journal of Secondary Education, XI (March, 1936), 137-142.

"The Pasadena Junior College Experiment." Junior College Journal, II (October, 1931), 4-10.

"The Place of the Junior College in Public Education." Educational Review, LXVII (April, 1924), 187-191.

"The Rechristening of the Junior Colleges." California Journal of Secondary Education, XIX (April, 1944), 204-207.

"State Higher Education in California." Junior College Journal, III (October, 1932), 42-43.

"A Suggested Orientation Program For Junior Colleges." Department of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXV (March, 1929), 348-359.

"Vocational Completion Courses at Pasadena Junior College." California Journal of Secondary Education, XI (November, 1936), 434-437.

Selected Works by William Rainey Harper

"The Associate Degree." Educational Review, XIX (April, 1900), 412-415.

"The General Conference." School Review, XII (January, 1904), 15-28.

"The High School of the Future." School Review, XI (January, 1903), 1-3.

"Ideals of Educational Work." National Education Association Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, XXXIV (1895), 987-998.

"Length of the Baccalaureate Course." National Education Association Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, XLII (1903), 504-509.

"The President's Report: Administration." The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1903.

The Prospects of the Small College. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900.

"Report of the Commission of Twenty-One." School Review, XIII (January, 1905), 23-24.

The Trend in Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905.

"The Trend of University and College Education in the United States." North American Review, CLXXIV (April, 1902), 457-465.

Selected Works by Robert M. Hutchins

"The American Educational System." The School Review, XLI (February, 1933), 95-100.

The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953.

"The Confusion in Higher Education." Harper's Magazine, October, 1936, pp. 449-458.

"Education and the Public Mind." School and Society, XXXVIII (August 5, 1933), 161-165.

"Hard Times and the Higher Learning." Yale Review, XXII (June, 1933), 714-730.

The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

"The Junior College." Educational Record, XIX (January, 1938), 5-11.

"The Junior College and General Education." Department of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXII (May, 1938), 22-25.

"The Junior College and Terminal Education." Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 347-354.

No Friendly Voice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

"The Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education." Educational Record, XXIX (April, 1948), 107-122.

Some Observations on American Education. London: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

"The Time is Now." Liberal Education: Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, L (May, 1964), 249-262.

"Turn High Schools into Peoples' Colleges." National Education Association Journal, XXIII (November, 1934), 217.

"What is a General Education?" Harper's Magazine, November, 1936, pp. 602-609.

Selected Works by B. Lamar Johnson

"California Junior College Curriculum Development." California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXI (March, 1956), 134-138.

"Criteria for Defining New Type of Courses." School and Society, XLII (September 14, 1935), 359-365.

"An Emerging Concept Points to the Future." Junior College Journal, XXV (April, 1955), 482-485.

"Encouraging Innovation in Teaching." Junior College Journal, XXXIX (March, 1969), 18-22.

"Footnotes on Junior College Standards." California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXV (May, 1960), 277-283.

"General Education Changes and the College." Journal of Higher Education, IX (January, 1938), 18-22.

"General Education for Citizenship." Junior College Journal, XXIII (October, 1952), 91-97.

General Education in Action. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.

"General Education in the Junior College." North Central Association Quarterly, XXIV (April, 1950), 357-363.

"Guidelines and Trends in Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical Education." Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (April, 1965), 376-380.

"Institutional Research in Western Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XXXII (March, 1962), 370-379.

Islands of Innovation. Occasional Report No. 6. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, School of Education, University of California, 1964.

Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969.

"The Junior College." General Education in the American College. The Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1939.

"The Junior College: Its Role and Its Future." Phi Delta Kappan, XXXVIII (February, 1957), 182-187.

"Junior-College Trends." School Review, LII (December, 1944), 606-610.

"Liberalization of the Curriculum." Junior College Journal, VI (October, 1953), 21-25.

"Needed: Experimental Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XXXVI (October, 1965), 17-20.

"Patterns of General Education." Junior College Journal, XVII (October, 1946), 45-52.

Starting a Community Junior College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1964.

"Strengths and Weaknesses of General Education." Journal of Higher Education, IX (February, 1938), 71-76.

"Toward General Education in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XXX (May, 1960), 517-524.

"Trends and Tangents." Journal of Higher Education, XXXIV (October, 1963), 407-409.

Selected Works by David Starr Jordan

"The Actual and the Proper Lines of Distinction Between College and University Work." Association of American Universities Journal, V (1904), 25-33.

The Blood of the Nation: A Study of the Decay of Races Through the Survival of the Unfit. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1910.

"The Care and Culture of Freshmen." North American Review, CXCI (April, 1910), 441-448.

The Care and Culture of Men. San Francisco: The Whitaker & Ray Co., 1896.

"The College and the University." Science, XXVII (April 3, 1908), 530-533.

The Days of a Man: Being Memories of a Naturalist, Teacher, and Minor Prophet of Democracy. 2 vols. New York: World Book Co., 1922.

Democracy and World Relations. New York: World Book Co., 1918.

"The Foundation Ideals of Stanford University." Leland Stanford Junior University Trustees' Series No. 27, 1915.

"The High-School Course." Educational Review, XXXVI (November, 1908), 372-376.

"The High School of the Twentieth Century." The School Review, XII (September, 1904), 545-549.

The Higher Foolishness. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1927.

The Human Harvest: A Study of the Decay of Races Through the Survival of the Unfit. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1907.

"The Junior College." The Forum, LXXV (March, 1926), 448-450.

Life's Enthusiasms. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1906.

"The New Fight for Democracy." Sunset, XLIII (September, 1919), 23-24ff.

"The University and Moral Teaching." School and Society, XX (December 20, 1924), 793-794.

"University Tendencies in America." Popular Science Monthly, XLIII (June, 1903), 141-148.

The Voice of the Scholar. San Francisco: Paul Elder & Co., 1903.

War and the Breed. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1915.

War and Waste. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1913.

Ways to Lasting Peace. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1916.

World Peace and the College Man. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1916.

Selected Works by Leonard V. Koos

The Administration of Secondary-School Units. Supplementary Educational Monographs. Vol. I, No. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1917.

The American Secondary School. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1927.

"The Community College as a 'Glorified High School.'" Junior College Journal, XIX (April, 1949), 429-430.

"A Comparison of Aims From Elementary School to University." Educational Review, LXIX (April, 1925), 176-183.

"Conditions Favor Integration of Junior Colleges with High Schools." School Life, XII (May, 1927), 161-164.

"Current Conceptions of the Special Purposes of the Junior College." School Review, XXIX (September, 1921), 520-529.

"A Danger and an Opportunity." School Review, LI (January, 1943), 2-3.

"Desirable Types of Junior-College Organization." School Review, XLIV (May, 1936), 372-382.

"Essentials in State-Wide Community-College Planning." School Review, LVII (September, 1949), 341-352.

"Guidance Practice in Secondary Schools." Department of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XX (March, 1928), 178-185.

"How to Democratize the Junior College Level." School Review, LII (May, 1944), 271-284.

"The Interpretation of Guidance." Junior-Senior High School Clearinghouse, VIII (September, 1933), 8-11.

"Is New York Different?" Junior College Journal, IX (March, 1939), 291-292.

"Is the Junior College Secondary or Higher Education?" Junior College Journal, XVIII (November, 1947), 113-114.

The Junior College. 2 vols. A Research Publication of the University of Minnesota. Education Series. No. 5. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924.

"The Junior College." Higher Education in America. Edited by Raymond A. Kent. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1930.

"Junior-College Administrators and Their Scope of Functions." School Review, LII (March, 1944), 143-150.

"The Junior College Curriculum." The School Review, XXXV (November, 1927), 657-672.

The Junior-College Movement. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.

"The Junior College Movement." The New Republic, XXXVI (November 7, 1923), 22-24.

———.

"The Junior College's Full Scope of Function." Junior College Journal, XVIII (October, 1947), 55-56.

The Junior High School. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1920.

"Largely Reminiscent: Plus the Commonwealth Fund Project." Junior College Journal, XXXIV (May, 1964), 14.

"The Next Step in Secondary Education." Secondary Education, IV (January, 1935), 18-20.

"Opinions of Administrators on Organizing the Junior College." School Review, LII (April, 1944), 215-227.

"Organizational Relationships of Junior College and High School." Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, XVIII (July, 1943), 399-407.

"Points of Needed Curriculum Development." Junior College Journal, XVI (May, 1946), 401-410.

"Preparation for Community-College Teaching." Journal of Higher Education, XXI (June, 1950), 309-317.

"Program of Guidance in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, II (May, 1932), 443.

"Progress and Problems of Secondary Education in California." School Life, XV (January, 1929), 81-83.

"A Quarter-Century with the Junior College." Journal of Higher Education, IX (January, 1938), 1-6.

"Rise of the People's College." School Review, LV (March, 1947), 139-149.

"Some Essentials in Student Personnel Work." Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 602-609.

"Statistics and Scholarship." Junior College Journal, XIX (October, 1948), 57-58.

"Training of Junior College Teachers." Junior College Journal, IV (January, 1934), 163-164.

Trends in American Secondary Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

"We Need Junior Colleges." World's Work, LVI (June, 1928), 201-202.

"What the Depression Taught the Schools." New York State Education, XIII (April, 1936), 534-535.

"Who Should Go to College?" Junior College Journal, XVIII (January, 1948), 229-230.

Selected Works by Alexis F. Lange

"The Course for Training Secondary School Teachers." The Sierra Educational News, XV (October, 1919), 507-510.

"Junior College." Sierra Educational News, XII (May, 1916), 277-280.

"The Junior College." The Sierra Educational News, XVI (October, 1920), 483-486.

"A Junior College Department of Civic Education." School and Society, II (September 25, 1915), 442-448.

"The Junior College--What Manner of Child Shall This Be?!" School and Society, VII (February 23, 1918), 211-216.

"The Junior College With Special Reference to California." Educational Administration, II (January, 1916), 1-8.

The Lange Book. San Francisco: The Trade Publishing Co., 1927.

"The New High School and the New High-School Teacher." School and Society, IV (August 19, 1916), 267-272.

"New Wine in New Bottles." Manual Training Magazine, (September, 1917), 9-12.

"Our Preparedness Program." School and Society, VI (September 29, 1917), 361-366.

"Preparedness." School and Society, V (January 6, 1917), 1-10.

Some Phases of University Efficiency. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1911.

"The State University and the Secondary School," The Sierra Educational News, XV (April, 1919), 187-188.

Selected Works by S. V. Martorana

"Coats Off to the Future: The Role of the Federal Office of Education." Junior College Journal, XXVIII (September, 1957), 15-20.

"Consideration of Two-Year Colleges in Recent Statewide Studies of Higher Education." Higher Education, XIV (October, 1957), 23-27; and XIV (November, 1957), 46-50.

"Developments in State-Level Governance." Junior College Journal, XXIX (December, 1968), 25-29.

"Functional Family-Life Education in Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XIX (October, 1948), 79-88.

"General Education for International Understanding." Junior College Journal, XX (November, 1949), 134-140.

"Implications of Wartime Adjustments for Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XVII (September, 1946), 11-17.

"Integrating College and Community." Junior College Journal, XIX (February, 1949), 309-310.

"Problems in Adult Education in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XVIII (November, 1947), 115-123.

"Progress and Plans in the Empire State." XXXV (May, 1965), 10-13.

"Reorganization in Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education, XXVII (December, 1956), 471-474ff.

"Where and How New Community Colleges are likely to Develop." School Review, LIX (January, 1951), 25-31.

Selected Works by Leland L. Medsker

"Between Two Decades in the Association." Junior College Journal, XIX (May, 1949), 492-500.

"Chicago Faces the Issue on Terminal Courses." Junior College Journal, IX (December, 1938), 109-111.

"Community College Education." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed. Edited by Robert L. Ebel. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962.

"Cooperative Action among Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges: Opportunities and Obstacles." Educational Record, XXXIX (April, 1958), 114-121.

"Diversity--A Fact and a Responsibility." Junior College Journal, XXVIII (May, 1958), 505-513.

"How Chicago Colleges Are Meeting the Need." Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 456-461.

"The Junior College Movement." Chicago Schools Journal, XXI (January, 1940), 172-174.

"The Junior College Picture." Junior College Journal, XLVII (December, 1958), 628-630.

The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

"Junior Colleges in This Period of Crisis." Junior College Journal, XXIII (January, 1952), 249-256.

"Reports on Study of Terminal Education." Junior College Journal, XII (March, 1942), 399-400.

"The Role of the Junior College in Community Educational Service." Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, XX (1948), 63-71.

"Significant Issues in the Junior-College Curriculum." California Journal of Secondary Education, XXIII (May, 1948), 296-299.

"The Wartime Role of Our Junior Colleges." School Executive, LXII (January, 1943), 18-19ff.

"What Do We Have in the Junior College?" Chicago Schools Journal, XXIX (September, 1947), 2-7.

"What is the Most Constructive Role for the Junior Colleges?" Current Issues in Higher Education: Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual National Conference on Higher Education. Chicago, 1960.

Selected Works by James W. Reynolds

"Certain Junior-College Problems." Junior College Journal, XVII (December, 1946), 134-138.

"Community Relations." Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 529-531.

The Comprehensive Junior College Curriculum. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1969.

"Conservation of Human Resources." Junior College Journal, XXX (September, 1959), 1-2.

"The Folklore of Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XXVIII (September, 1957), 1-2.

"General Education and the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XX (January, 1950), 239-240.

"General Education in Public Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, XVI (March, 1946), 308-319.

"Images of Services of Junior Colleges?" Junior College Journal, XXXIII (September, 1962), 1-2.

"Inadequacies of General Education Programs." Junior College Journal, XVI (April, 1946), 363-368.

The Junior College. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.

"The Junior College." School Executive, LXVIII (April, 1949), 69-70.

"The Junior College and High School Curriculums." Junior College Journal, XXI (October, 1950), 61-62.

"The Junior College and Industrial Education." Industrial Education Magazine, XLI (November, 1939), 230-236.

"The Junior College Student." Junior College Journal, XXVII (September, 1956), 1-2.

"Maintaining Equilibrium in the Junior College Curriculum." Junior College Journal, XXI (November, 1950), 123-124.

"Needed Changes in Purposes and Programs of Community Colleges." Universal Higher Education. Edited by Earl J. McGrath. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

"The Preparation Needed for Faculty Members in Junior Colleges." Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Education, XVIII (1946), 34-46.

"Preprofessional Training in Junior College." Junior College Journal, XI (February, 1941), 319-321.

"Community Services." The Public Junior College. The Fifty-fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Part I. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education, 1956.

"'Terminal Education.'" Junior College Journal, XX (December, 1949), 177-178.

"Tidal Wave and the Community College." School Executive, LXXIV (July, 1955), 19-21.

"What is a Community College?" Junior College Journal, XXI (December, 1950), 201-202.

"What is a Junior College?" Junior College Journal, XXX (April, 1960), 427-428.

"Who Are the Special Students?" Junior College Journal, XX (October, 1949), 59-60.

Selected Works by Nicholas Ricciardi

"Accrediting Curricula of Technical-Institute Type." California Journal of Secondary Education, XXII (March, 1947), 166-169.

"Curriculum-Building Meets Expanding Needs." Junior College Journal, VII (May, 1937), 444-447.

"Diagnosis and Action." Junior College Journal, IX (October, 1938), 1-3.

"Discussion of Terminal Courses in California in Junior Colleges." Proceedings of the Eighth Annual American Association of Junior Colleges Meeting. Chicago, 1928.

"Education and the Economic Crisis." Sierra Educational News, XXVII (October, 1931), 10-11.

"Education for the Common Life." Junior College Journal, VIII (January, 1938), 163-164.

"For What Occupations Should the State Prepare Its Workers?" Industrial Education Magazine, XXVII (November, 1925), 141-143.

"Junior College Cultural and Vocational Completion Courses." California Journal of Secondary Education, XI (November, 1936), 403-408.

"The Junior College of Tomorrow." School Executive, LV (March, 1936), 266-268.

"Junior College Organization." Junior College Journal, VII (May, 1937), 425-429.

"Junior College Standards." California Quarterly of Secondary Education, VIII (October, 1932), 87-93.

"Linking the Modern High School With Industry." Industrial Education Magazine, XXXII (November, 1930), 149-150.

The Need for Terminal Courses in the Junior College. California Department of Education Bulletin No. C-6. Sacramento: Government State Printing Office, 1928.

"A Philosophy of Vocational Education and Its Sources." Industrial Education Magazine, XXIX (July, 1927), 7-10.

"Vital Junior College Problems in California." Junior College Journal, I (October, 1930), 24-27.

"Vocational Curricula." Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 596-599.

"The Way to Economic Freedom." School Executives Magazine, LIV (October, 1934), 50.

"What May be Expected of the Junior College?" Junior College Journal, V (October, 1934), 10-12.

"What Should Be Expected of the Association?" Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 422-428.

Selected Works by L. W. Smith

"Americanization in the Thornton Township High School." The School Review, XXVIII (November, 1920), 659-672.

"Counseling and Guidance Problems in the Junior College." California Quarterly of Secondary Education, V (June, 1930), 343-348.

"Current Conditions in Junior College Development." AAJC Proceedings of Tenth Annual American Association of Junior Colleges Meeting.

"Discussion on the Junior College." Proceedings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, XXX, Part II (March, 1925), 56-64.

"Founding of Early JC's--President Harper's Influence." Junior College Journal, XI (May, 1941), 511-521.

"Industrial Education in Joliet Township High School." Industrial Education Magazine, XXIV (June, 1923), 359-364.

"The Junior College, A Two, Four, or Six Year Institution?" Proceedings of the Sixth Annual American Association of Junior Colleges Meeting. Chicago, 1926.

"Junior College Objectives." Proceedings of the Ninth Annual American Association of Junior Colleges Meeting. Ft. Worth, Texas, 1928.

"The Significance of the Junior College Movement." Chicago Schools Journal, XI (October, 1928), 41-46.

"The Significance of the Junior College Movement." Proceedings of the High School Conference, November, 1927. University of Illinois. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1928.

"A Summary of Current Conditions in Junior College Development." Nation's Schools, VIII (July, 1931), 41-48.

Selected Works by James M. Wood

"A College Curriculum for Women." Problems of College Education. Edited by Earl Hundleson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1928.

"The Four Year Junior College." Proceeding of the Eighth Annual American Association of Junior Colleges Meeting. Chicago, 1928.

"The Function of the Junior College." National Conference of Junior Colleges, 1920, and First Annual Meeting of American Association of Junior Colleges, 1921. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1922, No. 19. Edited by George F. Zook. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1922.

"The Junior College." Journal of Education, LXXXIV (July 27, 1916), 92.

"The Junior College." Junior College Journal, I (April, 1931), 440-441.

"The Junior College and General Education." Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals, XXI (May, 1938), 22-23.

"The Junior College in Secondary Education." Proceedings of the Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions. Purdue University, 1929.

"Long Beach--Menlo--Stephens Co-operation." Junior College Journal, I (February, 1931), 242-250.

"An Open Letter." Junior College Journal, I (March, 1931), 392-393.

"Patriotism and the College Student." Junior College Journal, XII (January, 1942), 248-250.

"Twenty Years" Progress." Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 511-518.

"What the Private Junior College Has to Offer." Nation's Schools, XXXV (April, 1945), 31.

"A Woman's Right to a Right Education." Progressive Education, XVI (January, 1939), 44-50.

Selected Works by George F. Zook

"Changing Patterns of Junior College Education." Junior College Journal, XVI (May, 1946), 411-417.

"Education--What For?" Junior College Journal, XX (May, 1950), 523-530.

"General Education at Junior College Level." Junior College Journal, IX (April, 1939), 353-354.

"Implications of the Junior College Movement." Junior College Journal, II (February, 1932), 249-250.

"Is the Junior College a Menace or a Boon?" The School Review, XXXVII (June, 1929), 415-425.

"The Junior College." The School Review, XXX (October, 1922), 575-583.

"Junior College: Dependent or Independent?" Junior College Journal, V (May, 1935), 432-436.

"The Junior College in the State's Program of Education." Department of Secondary-School Principals Bulletin, XXX (March, 1930), 74-83.

"The Junior College Movement." School and Society, XXIII (May 15, 1926), 601-605.

"The Past Twenty Years--The Next Twenty Years." Junior College Journal, X (May, 1940), 617-623.

Secondary Sources

Aldridge, Jack H. "A Comparative Study of Ideas and Theories, Concerning Junior Colleges, of Educational Leaders: 1900-1935 and 1945-1960." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1967.

"Alexis Frederick Lange--A Symposium." The Sierra Educational News, XX (October, 1924), 561-565.

Barzun, Jacques, and Graff, Henry F. The Modern Researcher. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1957.

Blocker, Clyde E.; Plummer, Robert H.; and Richardson, Richard C., Jr. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1965.

Bowers, C. A. The Progressive Educator and the Depression. New York: Random House, 1969.

Brick, Michael. Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Brown, Hugh S. and Mayhew, Lewis B. American Higher Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.

Brubacher, John S. Bases for Policy in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

________, and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Butts, R. Freeman. The College Charts Its Course. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1939.

________, and Cremin, Lawrence A. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. State Higher Education in California. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1932.

Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Cohen, Arthur M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Conger, George R., III. "Leonard V. Koos: His Contribution to American Education During Half a Century." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1968.

_______, and Schultz, Raymond E. "Leonard V. Koos: Patriarch of the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XL (March, 1970), 26-31.

Counts, George S. The Selective Character of American Secondary Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.

Cowley, William H. "The War on the College." Atlantic Monthly, June, 1942, pp. 719-726.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. Patterson, N.J.: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959.

Curtis, S. J., and Boultwood, M. E. A. A Short History of Educational Ideas. London: University Tutorial Press, Ltd., 1964.

Dewey, John. "Current Problems in Secondary Schools." School Review, X (January, 1902), 17-18.

_______. "Shortening the Years of Elementary Schools." School Review, XI (January, 1903), 17-20.

Diekhoff, John S. Democracy's College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

Directory of the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.

Drost, Walter H. David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Duffus, R.L. Democracy Enters the College: A Study of the Rise and Decline of the Academic Lockstep. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

Evermann, Barton W. "David Starr Jordan." Dictionary of American Biography. Vol. X, pp. 211-214.

Fawcett, John, Jr. "Doak S. Campbell and Southern Education." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966.

Fisher, Berenice M. Industrial Education: American Ideals and Institutions. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.

Folwell, William Watts. University Addresses. Minneapolis: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1909.

Gallagher, Edward A. "From Tappan to Lange: Evolution of the Public Junior College Idea." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1968.

General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Gerber, Daniel R. "William Watts Folwell and the Idea of the Junior College." Junior College Journal, XLI (March, 1971), 50-53.

Goldman, Eric F. Rendezvous With Destiny. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

Goodspeed, Thomas W. William Rainey Harper. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Gould, Joseph E. The Chautauqua Movement. New York: State University of New York, 1961.

Haber, Samuel. Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Handlin, Oscar. John Dewey's Challenge to Education. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

________, and Handlin, Mary F. The American College and American Culture. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.

Harris, Michael R. Five Counterrevolutionists in Higher Education. Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1970.

Harris, Nigel. Beliefs in Society: The Problem of Ideology. London: C. A. Watts & Co., 1968.

Hatfield, Thomas M. "A Junior College Man." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1966.

Hays, Samuel P. Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890-1920. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Hillway, Tyrus. The American Two-Year College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

________. Social Darwinism in American Thought. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1959.

Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Katz, Michael B. The Irony of Early School Reform. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Kemp, W. W. "Alexis Frederick Lange." The Dictionary of American Biography. Vol. X, pp. 591.

Knoell, Dorothy. "A Critical Review of Research on the College Dropout." The College Dropout and the Utilization of Talent. Edited by Pervin, L.A.; Reik, L.E.; and Dalrymple, W. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

________. People Who Need College: A Report on Students We Have Yet to Serve. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

________, and Medsker, Leland L. From Junior to Senior College: A Study of the Transfer Student. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Kolko, Gabriel. The Triumph of Conservatism. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Krug, Edward A. The Shaping of the American High School, 1890-1920. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969.

McDowell, F. M. The Junior College. U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 35. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1919.

MacLean, Malcolm S. "The General College: The University of Minnesota." General Education: Its Nature, Scope, and Essential Elements. Edited by William S. Gray. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Mannheim, Karl. Ideology and Utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1936.

Matson, Jane E. "Characteristics of Students Who Withdraw from a Public Junior College." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.

May, Henry F. The End of American Innocence. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.

Mays, Arthur Beverly. The Concept of Vocational Education in the Thinking of the General Educator, 1845 to 1945. Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin No. 62. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946.

Meiklejohn, Alexander. The Experimental College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932.

Moore, William, Jr. Against the Odds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Nunis, Doyce B. and Bossone, Richard M. "The Junior College's Search for an Educational Identity." Junior College Journal, XXXIII (November, 1962), 121-124.

O'Banion, Terry and O'Connell, April. The Shared Journey: An Introduction to Encounter. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Palmer, George Herbert. "The Junior College." Atlantic Monthly, April 27, 1927, pp. 497-501.

________. "The Junior College Again." Atlantic Monthly, December, 1927, pp. 828-830.

Perkinson, Henry J. The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965. New York: Random House, 1968.

Peterson, Merrill D. The Jefferson Image in the American Mind. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.

President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. 6 Vols. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

President's Commission on National Goals. Goals for Americans. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.

The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. Second Report to the President. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

Reed, Lloyd D. "Jesse Parker Bogue: Missionary for the Two-Year College." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

"Report on Stephens College." Junior College Journal, I (December, 1930), 160-161.

"Report of the President's Task Force on Higher Education." The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 19, 1970, pp. 3-4.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Sexson, John A. and Harbeson, John W. The New American College: The Four-Year Junior College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Shorey, Paul. "William Rainey Harper." Dictionary of American Biography. Vol. VIII, pp. 287-292.

Sizer, Theodore R. Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

Smolich, Robert S. "An Analysis of Influences Affecting the Origin and Early Development of Three Mid-Western Public Junior Colleges--Joliet, Goshen, and Crane." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1967.

Storr, Richard J. Harper's University: The Beginnings. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Tappan, Henry P. University Education. New York: George P. Putnam, 1851.

Thomas, Frank Waters, "A Study of Functions of the Public Junior College and the Extent of their Realization in California." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1926.

Thomas, Russell. The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States: Colonial Times to 1957. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

Veblen, Thorstein. The Higher Learning in America. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918.

Venn, Grant. Man, Education, and Work. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Ward, Phebe. Terminal Education in the Junior College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947.

Weinstein, James. The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900-1918. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Welter, Rush. Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Wesley, Edgar B. NEA: The First Hundred Years. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957.

White, Morton G. Social Thought in America: The Revolt Against Formalism. New York: The Viking Press, 1949.

Wiebe, Robert H. The Search for Order, 1877-1920. New York: Hill & Wang, 1967.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 16 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION